AN ANSWER TO THE CONSIDERATIONS

Which obliged

PETER MANBY, &c.

(As he pretends) to EMBRACE, what he calls,

THE

CATHOLICK RELIGION.

By *William King*, Chancellor of St. *Patricks*, *Dublin*.

Isaiah 1. 2.

——*I have nouriſhed, and brought up Children, and they have rebelled againſt me.*

DUBLIN,

Printed by *Joſeph Ray*, and are to be ſold by *John North*, Bookſeller in *Skinner-row*, and at the Printing-houſe on *Colledge-green*, 1687.

Imprimatur,

Hic Liber cui Titulus, An Anſwer to the Conſiderations which moved *Peter Manby* Dean of *Derry* to embrace, what he calls, the Catholick Religion.

Jun. 1. 1687.

Rad. Rule Reverendiſſimo D. ac D. Franciſco Archiepiſc. Dubl. à ſacr. Domeſt.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

The CONTENTS.

Chap. 1. The Examination of his Preface.

Sect. 1. *The Introduction.* Sect. 2. *Whether Mr.* M. *really desired information?* S. 3. *Catholick Church defined.* S. 4. *Answer to his first Question, what Church meant by the Catholick?* S. 5. *To his second Question, whether the Church of* England? S. 6. *To his third Question, with what other Church she Communicates?* S. 7. *To his fourth, whether the variety of all Protestants be the Catholick Church?* S. 8. *To his fifth Question, whether we and* Lutherans *are the same in all material points?* S. 9. *Our Church visible before* Edward VI. S. 11. *His unfair dealing with Dr.* Heylin, and *Dr.* Burnet.

Chap. 2. About Mission.

Sect. 1. *His Letter to his Grace the Lord* Primate *examined.* S. 2. *The Questions concerning Mission reduced to five heads.* S. 3. *The validity of our Orders.* S. 5. *Answer to his first question, what Priesthood had the first Reformers but what they received from Roman Catholick Bishops?* S. 6. *To his second, who Authorized them to teach their Protestant Doctrine,* &c. S. 7. *To his third, whether* Cranmer *did condemn the Church of* Rome, *and by what Authority?* S. 8. *To his fourth, whether a* Presbyterian *can preach against the Church of* England *by virtue of Orders received from her?* S. 9. *To his fifth, whether an Act of Parliament in* France, &c. *be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in* England *for Protestancy?* S. 10. *Mr.* M's *Objections against the first Reformers considered.* S. 12. *His Objections against* Cranmer *in particular Answered,* to the end.

Chap. 3. About Confession.

Sect. 1. *Whether we in our Church differ about Confession?* S. 2. *The Doctrine of our Church in this matter whence Confession appears not to be wanting.* S. 3. *His Argument proposed out of St.* John 1. 9 *compared with* John 20. 23. S. 4. *The words* if we Confess, John 1 Ep. 1. 9. *shewn not to refer to Auricular Confession.* S. 5. *Gods faithfulness and Justice mentioned* John 1 Ep. 1. 9 *do not respect particularly the Promise,* John 20. 23. S. 6. *If they did, yet this wou'd not prove Auricular Confession.* S. 7. & 8. *His second Argument from the practice of all Ages and Churches considered, and shewn to*

be

be false. S. 9. *His third Argument from the inconveniency that attends the want of Confession.* S. 11. *His fourth Argument from the interest of the Priest.*

Chap. 4. About the place of the Catholick Church.

Sect. 1. *Answer to his third difficulty, where is the Catholick Church?* S. 2. *Whether extant before* Cranmer? S. 3. *Whether* Cranmer *believed himself a Member thereof?* S. 4, 5. *The Reformation justifiable without charging the Church of* Rome *with Idolatry.* S. 6, 7, 8. *All Idolatry not inconsistent with the Being of a Church.* S. 9. *The weakness of his Argument brought to prove it.*

Chap. 5. An Answer to the heap of particulars thrown together at the latter end of his Paper.

Sect. 1 and 2. *His endeavour to vindicate his Church in her Devotions.* S. 3. *Whether all elevated and judicious.* S. 4. *His first Answer taken from the* Benedicite *to Protestant Objections against Prayers in the Mass directed to Saints.* S. 5. *The second from the Angels being Favourites.* S. 6. *The third from their knowing our Affairs.* S. 7. *His Excuses for the Mass being in an unknown Tongue.* S. 8. *His Vindication of the Worship of Images, from the Council of* Trents *forbidding Superstition.* S. 9. *From Kneeling at the Sacrament.* S. 10. *From* Presbyterian *Objections against our Practice.* S. 11. *His Excuse for the ill Practices and Opinions of some Roman Catholicks.* S. 12. *His recmomendation of his Church from her Books of Devotion.* S. 13. *From the Devotion of her people.* S. 14. *From the unity of her Members, that unity shewed not to be so great as pretended, from the Schisms that have been in her about Ordinations.* S. 15. *From the disputes about Confirmation.* S. 16. *About Confession.* S. 17. *What he objects against the Church of* England, *first from her stealing her Communion Service.* S. 18. *Secondly, from her want of a due Foundadation.* S. 19. *For trusting reason too far.* S. 20. *And contradict ing the visible Church.* S. 21. *Thirdly, Not yielding a due Submission.* S. 22. *Due Submission shewn to be paid by her to the uniuniversal Church, and taught to be due to particular Churches.* S. 23. *Mr.* M's. *Transcribing and Englishing* Calvin *examined together with his Inference.* S. 24. Mr. *M's Submission to the Catholick and the particular Church whereof he was a Member, examined.*

AN ANSWER TO THE CONSIDERATIONS

Which obliged *Peter Manby* Dean of *Derry* to embrace the Communion of the *Romish* Church.

CHAP. I.

To the Preface.

§. 1. *Peter Manby* Dean of *Derry* has choſen this time, (for what reaſons he knows beſt) to declare himſelf of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. Whoever doth ſo in the preſent circumſtances, muſt run the hazard of being cenſured, for having too great a value for the Favours and worldly Advantages that ſome late Converts have met with. In order therefore to ſatisfie the World that he had ſome other Reaſons beſides this proſpect (I ſuppoſe) he publiſhed this Pamphlet that I now anſwer. Whoever reads it, will find ſo little Method or Connexion between the parts of it, that he muſt conclude, the Writer was never acquainted with cloſe thinking; and that the looſneſs and immethodicalneſs of it, is the greateſt trouble lyes on the Anſwerer: the truth is, it ſticks chiefly on Formalities and Preliminaries, which no Advocate ever inſiſted much upon, that was confident of the merits of his Cauſe: and therefore to anſwer it can hardly be worth any ones labour. I confeſs I ſhould have thought ſo too, if I had not found ſome of his own party boaſting of it; and I do now aſſure him that I do not Anſwer it

out of any apprehenſion I have of its ſeducing any of ours; and that it had been anſwered long a go, if I had been poſſeſſed with any ſuch Suſpicion.

It conſiſts of three parts, and each of theſe do in effect contain the ſame things, and except a man give a diſtinct Anſwer to each, he may pretend that part is unanſwered. I ſhall therefore follow him in his own method, and conſider, *firſt*, his Preface to the Reader: *ſecondly*, the Pamphlet it ſelf: and *thirdly*, his Latine Queries, and beg the Readers Pardon, if he find the Anſwers ſometimes repeated, when Mr. *M.* repeats the queſtions ſo often.

§ 2. His Preface has huddled together ſome Queſtions and Dilemma's concerning the Catholick Church, and raiſed ſome doubts, concerning which he profeſſes himſelf to be at a loſs, and ſo deſires information —— Thus pag. 1. *When a Proteſtant rehearſes this Article of his Creed; I believe one Catholick Church, I would fain underſtand what Church he means?* Again, *this makes Proteſtancy ſo wandring and uncertain a thing, that I for my part cannot underſtand it.* Pag. 3. *He ſhall find me preſſing for an Anſwer to ſuch Queſtions as theſe.*

Pag. 1. of the Pamphlet, *There are three points wherein I could never ſatisfie my ſelf*; a little after, *I could never find any ſatisfactory Anſwer to this Queſtion.* Pag. 2. *pronouncing the Church of* Rome *Idolatrous, I would fain know by what Authority?* —— A little after, *by whoſe Authority — I cannot tell.* Pag. 3 *there was no Anſwer to be had.* —— A little after, *I cannot find.* l. 9. *I do not well underſtand.* l. 15. *I could never underſtand.* Pag. 4. *I would know.* Pag. 7. l. 13. *I confeſs my dullneſs underſtands not.* —— Pag. 8. line 16. *I would fain know.* line 25. *Which Anſwer I confeſs I do not underſtand* —— Pag. 11. line 15. *I deſire to be informed.* l. the laſt, *I cannot imagine.* Pag. 12. line 15. *I cannot underſtand.*

Now, if he was ſo very ignorant as he makes himſelf, and ſo deſirous of information, he ought to have conſulted ſome of his Spiritual Guides on theſe heads, and not truſted altogether to his own Judgment; or elſe he ought in all reaſon to have printed theſe Queſtions, before he reſolv'd them unanſwerable: for how

did

did he know, but ſome body might have had more to ſay to them then he was aware of, and haye given him ſatisfaction? If he had deſigned to be counted either a prudent or honeſt man, this had been his method; but I have enquired and cannot find that ever he propoſed them ſeriouſly to one Divine, or applyed himſelf to any in this weighty affair, before he deſerted our Communion; and therefore though perhaps he may be ignorant enough, yet I think it apparent that he only pretends want of underſtanding, and deſire of information; or that he has very little care of his Soul, or of what Communion he is.

§ 3. To give his Queſtions propoſed in his Preface a diſtinct Anſwer, I ſhall firſt rank them in method.

Concerning therefore the *Catholick Church*, he asks,

1. *What Church we mean?*
2. *Whether the Church of* England *alone, as eſtabliſhed by Law, or as in Communion with other Churches?*
3. *With what other Church under Heaven doth the Church of* England *communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy?*
4. *Whether the variety of Proteſtants be the Catholick Church, ſince they want her Eſſential mark* called *Unity?*
5. *Whether we and the Lutherans are of the ſame Church; the Lutherans holding a Corporal Preſence in the Sacrament, and we denying it?*

All theſe we have in the firſt page of his Preface, and all proceed from the ſame root, even ignorance of what is meant by the Catholick Church: If Mr. *M.* had deſigned to deal ingenuouſly and like a Scholar that deſired to clear things, (which ought to be the deſign of every honeſt writer,) he ought to have laid down a definition of the Catholick Church, and then examined to whom it belonged, and ſhown the Church as eſtabliſhed here by Law to be no part of it; for, till that be done, all that is ſaid is banter; for we mean not the ſame thing by the Church. I never ſaw any Romaniſt take this method, and therefore I have always believed that they rather deſigned to gain Proſelites by confounding their Heads, than by clear Reaſon and Information;

I will therefore tell him what I mean by the one Catholick Church in the Creed; and if he do not like the Deſcription, let him mend it.

The Catholick Church is the whole body of men, profeſſing the Religion of Chriſt, and living under their lawful Spiritual Governours. This body of Chriſtians is one, becauſe it has, according to St. *Paul, Epheſ.* 4. 5. *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God,* and according to Saint *Auguſtine, many Churches are one Church, becauſe there is one Faith, one Hope, one Charity, one Expectation; and laſtly, one heavenly Countrey*; now if he had been as much concerned to underſtand this aright, as he would have his *Dear Reader*, he might eaſily have ſeen who it is that fancy to themſelves a Church divided from all the reſt of the world, by breaking the bonds of Charity, and coyning new Articles, diſtinct from thoſe of the Catholick Faith, which we received from Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and that the Anſwers to his Queſtions are very eaſie.

Multæ gentes, modo una gens, quare una gens? quia una fides, quia una ſpes, quia una charitas, quia una expectatio; poſtremo quare non una gens, ſi una patria? patria cœleſtis eſt. S. Auguſt. tom 8. in Pſalm. 85.

§. 4. For to the firſt, when he would know *what Church we mean when we rehearſe that Article of our Creed, I believe one holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church?* the Anſwer is, that we mean, not any particular Church, nor any party of Chriſtians of any one denomination; but all thoſe that hold the Catholick Faith, and live under their lawful Paſtors: while they have thoſe marks I have laid down from the Scripture and St. *Auguſtine*, they are ſtill of one Communion, though by the peeviſhneſs and miſtake of their Governours, they may be engaged in Quarrels; as the Church of *Rome* was in St. *Cyprians* time with the Church of *Africa*, about the allowing the Baptiſm of Hereticks; and the quarrel came to that height, that when the *Africans* came to *Rome*, not only the peace of the Church and Communion was denyed them, but even the common kindneſs of Hoſpitality; as we may ſee in *Firmilians*

Pag. 1. Pref.

milians Epiſtle to Saint *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 75. This being ſuppoſed, it is no hard matter to find out the parts of this Catholick Church wherever one comes, it is only Examining whether any Church hold the Catholick Faith, and whether they live under their lawful Governours; and ſo far as they do ſo, it is our duty to joyn with them, as true parts thereof.

Preciperet fraternitati univerſæ, ne quis eos in domum ſuam reciperet, & venientibus non ſolum pax & communio, ſed etiam tectum & hoſpitium negaretur. *Cyprian*, Ep 75.

Whereas he who, with the Donatiſts, will unchurch three parts of four of the Chriſtian World; or fancy a Church divided from all others, though as ſound in Faith and as obedient to their Governours as poſſible; is like for ever to be *toſſed too and fro upon the unſtable waters of Schiſm*, and *dwindles the Church into a Faction*; and this gives a full Anſwer,

§ 5. To his ſecond Queſtion, *whether we mean by the Catholick Church, the Church of* England *alone, or the Church of* England *as in Communion with other Churches*; for by this it appears, that the Churches of *England* and *Ireland* are no more the Catholick Church, then the Engliſh Seas are the whole Ocean; but they are a part thereof, becauſe they hold the Catholick Faith intirely, and are governed by their lawful and Catholick Biſhops; who have not had for many years, ſo much as a Rival appearing to conteſt their Title and Succeſſion.

§ 6. But then he urges in the third place, *with what other Church doth the Church of* England *Communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy?*

To which I anſwer, Unity of Liturgy is no part of Communion of Churches; let him ſhew, if he can, that the Catholick Church ever had any ſuch Unity; Unity in Faith, Sacraments & in worſhiping God ſhe has with all true Churches on the face of the Earth, inſomuch that there is not one Article in her Creeds, nor one Petition in her Liturgy, that even Mr. *M.* can condemn; nor is there any Office wanting, in which the Ancient Liturgies agreed; and then let him ſhew why all Churches hold not Communion with her? and who is guilty of the breach thereof? If he

ſay

ſay that we hold indeed the Catholick Faith, but not intire, let him make it appear: but if he cannot prove that we deny any part of this Catholick Faith, he acquits us from Hereſie, and owns our union in Faith with the Catholick Church. To prove this defect was chiefly incumbent on him, but he has not ſo much as attempted it. He has indeed made an attempt againſt the lawfulneſs of our Governours, that is, to prove us Schiſmaticks; but how unſucceſsfully we ſhall ſee by and by.

§. 7. In the mean time to his fourth Demand, Whether by the *one Catholick Church be underſtood the variety of all Proteſtants, ſince they want her eſſential mark, even Unity?* I anſwer, that neither all Proteſtants are Catholick members of the Church, nor are Proteſtants only; thoſe among Proteſtants, that embrace the Catholick Faith, and make no Separation from their lawful Governors, and that live in unity of Faith and charity with their neighbour Churches are Catholick members, and have that Unity, which is eſſential to the Catholick Church; but theſe are not to be confounded with *Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptiſts, Fifth Monarchy-men, Quakers, &c.* ſince theſe have ſeparated themſelves from their lawful Governours, as much as Mr. *M.* himſelf; though their Crime be leſs than his: as he is leſs guilty that makes a Rebellion, than he who joyns with a Forreigner to enſlave his native Countrey.

But he has an Excuſe even for theſe, that he has *heard out of the mouths of ſome Proteſtants, that God had his people amongſt all ſorts of Proteſtants*; and what if ſome charitable people ſay with Saint *Auguſtine*; *that they who defend their Opinion, though falſe and perverſe without pertinaciouſneſs, eſpecially when they were not the Authors thereof, through their own confidence and preſumption, but received it from their ſeduced and erring Parents, and ſeek induſtriouſly the truth, and are ready to embrace it when they find*

Qui Sententiam ſuam quamvis falſam atque perverſam nullâ pertinaci animoſitate defendunt, præſertim quam non audacia præſumptionis ſuæ pepererunt, ſed à ſeductis atque in errorem lapſis parentibus acceperunt, quærunt autem cauta ſollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati cum invenerint, nequaquam ſunt inter Hæreticos deputandi. *Auguſt. Ep.* 162.

find it; are not at all to be reckoned Hereticks? is he ſure that there are not ſome ſuch amongſt every ſort of Proteſtants, nay of Chriſtians? I am ſure, the paſſage he quotes out of *the ſecond Paper* mentioned by him, is no Confutation of this; nor any thing to the purpoſe, except he hath a mind to prove the Words true by his own example: For, what Reaſon has he given why he quitted the Church in which he was baptized, educated and preferred (whether above his Deſerts, let the World judge by this Paper;) but *becauſe the Diſcipline* and Devotions of the Church of *Rome ſuit his preſent Fancy better than what he left*; becauſe he was not able to anſwer ſome few Queſtions that have no great difficulty in them, his private Judgment or Intereſt told him he ought to change his Church. And if he changed his Church on the confidence of a Judgement he acknowledges ſufficiently weak, why will he not allow the ſame liberty to others? If he ſay that the Church he has choſen is a Church from whence there *can be no appeal*; I anſwer, he has only his own Judgment for believing ſo; and when that Judgment alters, he may be of any other Church, and ſo he is fallen in ſpite of his endeavours into the ſame miſtake he would avoid. He brings in (to what purpoſe he knows perhaps himſelf) a Story of a paſſionate *Preſbyterian*, who ſaid, that *he cared not what his Son was, ſo he was not a Papiſt*: which may paſs for a Reaſon to thoſe that build their Faith on Stories and Legends, and uſe to give the Character of their Enemies only from their peeviſh Sayings, but is nothing to our Church.

He argues againſt Schiſm, from 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. *I beſeech you brethren that ye all ſpeak the ſame thing, and that there be no Schiſms among you*: as if the Church of which he pretended to be a Member did not abhor Schiſm as much as he; and as if the firſt Schiſm from her Communion had not been by Papiſts about the 10*th* of Queen *Elizabeth*. Now the ſame St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.*6. 18. adviſes them to *flee Fornication*, and that as a thing contrary to our Union with God: Mr. *M.* had beſt try his Logick, and ſee if he can from the firſt place, which forbids Schiſm, prove that it

makes

makes a Man more ceaſe to be a Member of the Church than Fornication doth, which is forbidden in the ſecond.

He produces out of *Romans* 15. 6. *that ye glorify God with one Mind and one Mouth*, to prove that we ought not only *ſay the ſame things, but the ſame words, eſpecially about Sacraments and Liturgy, for by one Spirit we* (*meaning all Chriſtians*) *are Baptized into one body; therefore he exhorts them to take heed of ſuch Teachers as have no Miſſion or Authority for what they ſay, but only good words & fair ſpeeches to deceive the hearts of the ſimple.* By the *for* and *therefore* in this ſentence one would expect that one part ſhould be a conſequence of another, but there is not the leaſt affinity between them: but you muſt excuſe him, for his talent never lay much, as has been obſerved by his Friends, in drawing conſequences.

Thoſe, that by *good words and fair ſpeeches deceive the hearts of the ſimple*, are not ſaid to want Miſſion, *Rom.* 16. 17. it is probable therefore they had it; but St. *Paul* gives very different marks to know them by, even teaching contrary to the Doctrine they had already received, ſerving their own Bellies ——— not our Lord Jeſus. Nonconformity therefore to the Doctrine taught by the Apoſtles, and too eager a concern for the Riches and intereſt of the Clergy are the ſigns of a falſe Teacher, though he have never ſo Authentick Miſſion according to St. *Paul*, nay, though he were an Angel from Heaven. But if he had been of Mr. *M*'s opinion, the *Romans* muſt not have judged of their Paſtors, or attempted to diſcover Seducers by their Doctrine, but only by calling for their Letters of Orders and Title from the Apoſtles.

§ 8. His fifth Queſtion concerning the Catholick Church is, *whether we and the Lutherans are the ſame in all material points; the Lutherans holding a corporeal Preſence in the Sacrament, and we denying it?* To which I anſwer, that a difference may be material, and yet not eſſential to Faith, ſo as to neceſſitate a diviſion of Church Unity; there is a very material difference between thoſe in the Church of *Rome* that hold the depoſing Power, and thoſe that deny it; between thoſe that hold the Pope infallible, and thoſe

thoſe that deny it,& ſo in many other points,as material as thoſe in diſpute between Proteſtant Churches; yet, inasmuch as they are not reckoned by all to be Eſſentials of Faith, they do not break Communion; and indeed,he underſtands very little that knows not there may be difference of underſtanding about matters relating to Sacraments, and yet Unity of Communion. As to his Objection againſt the Calviniſts, that *they have no Order of Prieſts or Biſhops*, I leave him to diſpute it with them, whether conſequently they *have no true Sacraments*, which he infers, I leave him to diſpute it with his new Church; we are concerned in neither.

§ 9. There is only one thing more he objects on this Head againſt our Church, and that is, that ſhe, as eſtabliſhed by Law, is *Catholick neither as to time nor place*, becauſe not *viſible any where for many Ages before* Edward *the ſixth*. This is the old Queſtion, *Where was your Church before* Luther? And has been often anſwered, by ſhewing that we made no new Church by the Reformation, that we kept all the Eſſentials of Faith and Worſhip received by our Anceſtors, had the ſame Creeds, the ſame God, Chriſt, Baptiſm, and Euchariſt; and laſtly, were governed by the ſame Biſhops and other Governours, before and after the Reformation; and therefore it is a wild thought in Mr. *M.* to affirm that our Church was not viſible before *Edward* the ſixth. It is true, it was not eſtabliſhed by Law in all points as it is now, no more was the Church of *Rome* before the Reformation by the Council of *Trent*, (for that alſo pretended to Reform) but the eſtabliſhing by Law is accidental altogether to a Church, and a Church may be viſible long before it is ſo eſtabliſhed.

This is all in his Preface that any way relates to the Catholick Church.

§ 10. The ſecond part relates to the Miſſion of our Biſhops, and is reduced to four Queries, which ſhall have their full Conſideration, when I come to conſider the firſt point that he lays down in his Book.

§ 11. The reſt is ſpent in comparing two Hiſtorians of the Reformation, that is Doctor *Heylin* and Doctor *Burnet*, of whom

he gives this Character, that *Burnet ſtrains all his wit to palliate the doings of the Reformers, and paint them out to advantage*; Heylin *repreſents them honeſtly for the moſt part, and in their own colours*: Whereas in truth the firſt doth generally lay down naked matter of Fact only, and leaves the Reader to judg; and the other paſſes his own Cenſures and gives his own Gloſs on them; as may be ſeen by the very paſſages Mr. *M.* quotes out of Doctor *Heylin*'s Preface. The truth is he abuſes both Hiſtorians; *Heylin* by producing that for matter of Fact, which is all his own Inferences and Conjectures, and ſo expreſt to be in the very words: *all that was done in order to a Reformation, ſeemed to be accidental only* then ——— *I cannot reckon his Death an infelicity* —— *it is not to be thought*, to the next clauſe, *nor was it like to happen*, to the next —— *might eaſily have done*, to the next —— *was in all probability* to the laſt.

Are not theſe Conjectures ſtrong Arguments to prove the Reformation unjuſtifiable? But he abuſes him yet more in the paſſage concerning the Duke of *Sommerſet*, by reporting that as Doctor *Heylin*'s Opinion, which he records only as the Opinion of others, *pag.* 116. of his Hiſtory; where among three or four Conjectures, why the Duke did not claim the benefit of his Clergy; he ſets down this laſt, *Finally whether it were ſome ſecret judgment on him from above* (*as ſome men conceived*) *that he, who had deſtroyed ſo many Churches*, &c. *ſhould want the benefit of Clergy in his greateſt extremity*; where Mr. *M.* leaves out the Parentheſis (*as ſome Men conceived*) and falſifies him (perhaps to make him recompence) by adding another of his own, *he* (the Duke of *Sommerſet*) *deprived many learned men of their means and livelyhood*; (*for being Papiſts* adds Mr. *M.*) a moſt notorious falſhood; ſince it appears from all Hiſtories of the Reformation, that there was an univerſal Complyance of the Clergy; few making any Oppoſition, and none almoſt abſolutely refuſing Conformity; his Papiſts at that time loved their Means ſo well, or found ſo little amiſs in the Reformation, that they readily complyed with all Changes. And as he thus abuſes and falſifies *Heylin*, ſo he doth *Burnet*; he ſaith, that

the

the worſt Burnet *can charge* Heylin *with, is his not vouching Authority for what he ſays*; and he affirms, that *it is an untruth, that* Heylin *writ upon uncertain grounds, as* Burnet *would inſinuate.* But *Burnet* in that place inſinuates no ſuch thing, but only ſays he ought to have vouched them, that people might have judged of their certainty. *Heylin*'s own Teſtimony for his fidelity is not to be taken in his own Cauſe; and therefore Mr. *M.* vindicates him very ill, when he produces nothing elſe for him. He ſaith *Doctor* Burnet *doth not produce one inſtance of any moment, wherein he dares ſay, Doctor* Heylin *is falſe.* I hope Mr. *M.* would not quote any paſſage out of *Heylin* that was not of moment; what if that paſſage that relates to the Duke of *Sommerſet* here quoted, be recorded falſly by *Heylin*, and taxt as falſe by *Burnet*? then I believe every body will judge Mr. *M.* either very ignorant or very malicious; and yet thus it is. Says Mr. *M.* from *Heylin, The Duke of* Sommerſet *was ſo defective in his Judgment, as not to crave the benefit of his Clergy, which might have ſaved his Life.* Now look into *Burnet ad Ann.* 1531. *pag.* 186. 2 *vol.* and ſee whether he have not theſe words, *Some late Writers have made an Inference upon his not claiming the benefit of Clergie, that he was thus left of God, not to plead that benefit; ſince he had ſo much invaded the Rights and Revenues of the Church; but in this they ſhewed their Ignorance; for by the Statute, That Felony, of which he was found Guilty, was not to be purged by Clergie.*

The moſt likely excuſe I can make for Mr. *M.* is, that he neither read *Burnet* nor *Heylin*; if he did, he either knew this, and conceal'd it; which makes him very diſingenuous: or did not obſerve it; and ſo he falls under the Character of a thoughtleſs Reader, that could neither by his own Obſervation, nor the Admonition of Friends avoid picking out, and repeating ſuch an uncharitable falſehood. It were eaſie to ſhew ſeveral falſehoods (even in thoſe things that are moſt invidious to the Reformation) in *Heylin*'s Hiſtory, obſerved and confuted by *Burnet*: one more particularly, in his ſaying, that the Father of Queen *Ann Boleyne* was one of the Jury that condemned her; with which, as a falſhood, he taxes *Heylin*

in his *Addenda, pag.* 363. first volume, where he says, that Doctor *Heylin took this as he did many other things too easily upon* Sanders's *credit*; which (if true) is enough to blast the credit of his Book with all Protestants, nay with all Men of Judgment that know what an infamous Lyar and Rebel *Sanders* was.

Whereas therefore he intreats the Protestant Reader to peruse Doctor *Heylin*'s History of the Reformation, we are content he should do so; and let him at the same time peruse the History of the Council of *Trent*, written by Father *Paul*, and let him impartially judg which was carried on by the worst Men and worst Arts; the Reformation, or the Council.

What Mr. *M.* objects further in his Preface against *Cranmer* and the other Reformers, shall be considered in its proper place.

CHAP. II.

I Come now to to examin the Pamphlet it self, which consists of Three parts.

1. A Letter to His Grace the Lord Primate of *Ireland*.
2. Of Three points wherein he could not satisfie himself.

And 3dly. A confused heap of particulars at the latter end.

As to the Letter; it is a little ambiguous to whom it is directed; if to his old Patron, as a civil Compliment at taking leave, he had done well to have told the true Reason why he forsook him. Your Grace would not get me a Bishoptick, though often prest and sollicited by me; therefore I beg your leave to seek a new Patron, whose Mediation may be more effectual. But perhaps Mr. *M.* means another man, and then we may reckon this as the first Fruits of his Conversion. Are you raught already the Art of Equivocation? We shall learn from this what sincerity we may expect from you; and shall hardly believe you when you tell us that it was not *any consideration of Temporal Interest inclined you to be reconciled.* If you valued Temporal Interest so little, why were you so earnest for a Protestant Bishoptick? Why did you repine and murmur so much that you were not preferred? Why did

did you declare to ſeveral about a year ago, that you was no Roman Catholick, but yet would not appear againſt the Church of *Rome*, becauſe you hoped to riſe by help of Roman Catholicks? Why did you endeavour to ingratiate you ſelf by mean Arts, and condeſcend even to the Office of an Informer? Why did you defer publiſhing this Paper (ſuch as it is) which was ready ſometime before, till you thought you might be ſure of keeping the Profits of your Deanery? Either you are a Lay or Clergy man? If a Lay man; are not you abominably Sacrilegious, to have poſſeſſed, and ſtill retain the Revenue of a Clergy man? Why do you retain the Title of Dean in the Frontiſpiece of a Book, which is deſigned to prove you to be no Prieſt, and conſequently incapable of it. If your Orders had yielded you as much *per annum* as your Deanery doth, Have we not reaſon to believe, you would no more have renounced the one than the other? For ſhame, reſign our Church her own, ſince you have deſerted her, or never talk of Conſcience. Till this be done, it is in vain for you to pretend that your having *reflected on the uncertainty and variety of the Proteſtant Spirit*, or *peruſed Catholick Books have undeceived you.* Did you never reflect on the uncertainty or variety of the Proteſtant Spirit before, that it ſhould have ſuch a mighty influence on you juſt at this time? ſure there was greater variety when you was firſt educated in the Colledge, and when you firſt entred into Orders than now. They talk'd much of the Spirit then, and you yet retain their language; if inſtead of that Cant you had well ſtudied and conſidered the Principles of the Church which you have left, you would have found that there neither are nor can be any more certain and ſteady Principles of any Religion, than hers are. You make your ſelf a great Novice, that at this time a day pretend to be converted by *peruſing the Maſs.* In good earneſt, did you never read it before? if you did, how comes it to have ſuch influence on you in King *James* the Second's time, and ſo little in King *Charles* the Second's? All you pretend for your ſelf is, that you were then under *Prejudice, and deceived by falſe Reports, concerning* (that you call) *the Catholick Religion*: that is, The Reverend

Dean

Dean after near 30 years ſtudy had his Religion by hear-ſays, wanted Honeſty to be impartial, and either Induſtry or Means to inform himſelf concerning the moſt material Controverſies that are on foot in the Church. Which Controverſies are ſtill the ſame, and the Arguments *pro* and *con* of the ſame force they were before in every thing, except the alteration of one circumſtance, that is, worldly Advantage. Is not this a moſt excellent Account of your Converſion? And whereas you tell His Grace, that *all that have known you theſe ſeveral years can witneſs for you, that it was not any conſideration of worldly Intereſt that inclined you*; you are obliged to beg His Graces pardon for your falſe Information: for, I can aſſure you, I have conſulted many that have known you, and have not met one that can witneſs this for you But on the contrary, the moſt conclude, that it was the little grain of Worldly Advantage turn'd the Scale for your new Church. This is therefore the true Account you ought to have given His Grace of your *Reconcilement*.

§. 2. The ſecond part of Mr. *M*'s Paper conſiſts of three points, wherein he profeſſes, that *he could never ſatisfie himſelf ſince he began to ſtudy the Controverſies between the two Churches.*

The firſt was, *The Miſſion or Authority of the firſt Reformers.*

The ſecond, The *Want of Confeſſion in the Church of* England.

And the third, *Where is that one holy Catholick Church we do profeſs to believe in the two Creeds?*

To the firſt of theſe points I ſhall reply in this method.

1. I will put together all the Queſtions that he asks on this Head.

2. Conſider the Anſwers he produces to them.

And 3. The Objections he has raiſed againſt the Reformation or Reformers.

1. Concerning our Miſſion he asks in his Preface, pag. 3. *What Prieſthood or Holy Orders had the firſt Reformers, but what they received from the hands of Roman Catholick Biſhops.*

What Prieſthood or Holy Orders have Proteſtants, but what they confeſs to have received from Roman Catholick Biſhops? Pag. 12. of the Pamphlet.

Who

2. *Who authorized the firſt Reformers to preach their Proteſtant Doctrine, and adminiſter their Proteſtant Sacraments?* Pag. 1. of his Pamphlet.

I am not now diſputing what Doctrine he preached; but who ſent him to preach his Proteſtant Doctrine, and adminiſter his Proteſtant Sacraments? 'Tis not his Doctrine, but Miſſion I am now enquiring after. Pag. 3.

3. *Whether* Cranmer *and his Aſſociates could condemn the Church of* Rome *by pretence of the Miſſion they received from her Biſhops?* Pag. 3. of his Preface,

I underſtand not —— how any man can juſtifie his Proteſtant Doctrine by authority of his Popiſh Miſſion. Pag. 2. of his Pamphlet.

I muſt ſtill ask the old Queſtion; By whoſe Authority did he condemn that Church, from whom he received his Miſſion? Pag. 3. of his Pamphlet.

The Archbiſhop of Canterbury, &c. *at the time of their Conſecration were profeſſed Roman Catholicks —— But afterwards turning Proteſtants and pronouncing the Church of* Rome *Idolatrous, I would fain know by whoſe Authority?* Pag. 2. of his Pamphlet.

At the time of their Conſecration they profeſſed Seven Sacraments, Anno 1536. *they retrencht them to three —— then to two,* Anno 1549. —— *By whoſe Authority or Miſſion I cannot tell.* Ibid. pag. 2.

Again, *Who gave them Authority to pronounce themſelves ſound Members, and the Church of* Rome *a corrupt Arm of the Catholick Church?* Pag. 12.

The Fourth Sett of Queſtions concerning Miſſion is on this Head; Preface p. 3. *Whether a Presbyterian Miniſter having received Orders from a Proteſtant Biſhop, can, by virtue of ſuch Orders, pronounce the Church of* England *a corrupt Church?*

I underſtand not how a man can forſake the Church of England, *and preach Presbyterian Docrine by vertue of his Proteſtant Orders.* Pag. 2. of his Pamphlet.

Presbyterians being Interrogated, —— Did that Church authoriſe you to preach againſt the Sacraments or Liturgie? there was no Anſwer to be had. Pag. 3.

Ibid

I desire to know, whether an honest man can preach against the Liturgie, Sacraments, or Constitution of any Church, by vertue of any Commission he received from it? Ibid.

So that no honest man can turn Presbyterian or Independant Preacher by vertue of his Protestant Mission p. 4.

The fifth Sett of Questions relating to Mission is, *Pref. pag.* 3. *Whether an Act of Parliament in* France, Spain *or* Germany, *be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in* England *for Protestancy?*

A Parliamentary Mission then our first Reformers had, and no other that I can find. p. 3.

§. 3. Before I come to a distinct consideration of each of these, I must observe that he waves the Dispute concerning our *Priestly or Episcopal Orders, whether valid or no*; (*Pamphl. pag.* 1.) Now, if these are valid, either let him shew one Sacrament *administred by Protestants*, which these Characters do not give them Power to celebrate: or one Article of Faith that they teach, which the same do not oblige them to teach: or else let him ask no more for their Mission, and Authority, to teach their Doctrine, and administer their Sacraments. If their Doctrine and Sacraments are not *Theirs* but Christs; they are not only sent, but obliged by their Orders to administer the one, and teach the other, in the Churches wherein they are appointed Pastors.

I observe further, that he manifestly contradicts himself in this matter; for he makes *Cranmer* and *Latimer the first Protestant Bishops*, and owns their Consecration (*p.*2.) and yet alledges (*p.*3) that *it is no easie matter to find out who consecrated the first Protestant Bishops*; because, forsooth, there were none to do it, *but Roman Catholick Bishops, who never use to consecrate any Protestants.* But if he had read *Mason*, and Archbishop *Bramhall*, he might have seen who ordained the first Reformers, and their Succession to this day: and if he had consulted Sir *James Ware de Præsulibus*, he might have seen that there wanted not Bishops in *Ireland* willing to consecrate Protestants; Primate *Loftus* being consecrated by the then Archbishop of *Dublin*, Dr. *Curwin*, who continued

tinued in his Archiepiſcopal See near ſix years after, and then by reaſon of his great Age was tranſlated to the Biſhoprick of *Oxford* at his own deſire. *Antiquit. Oxon. de Æde Chriſti. lib.* 2. *p.* 291. *Ware de præſulibus. Hib. in Archiepiſcopis Dublinienſibus*, p. 120.

Nor is the Teſtimony he produces out of *Burnet* from Queen *Mary* at all pertinent; all that appears from that Teſtimony is, that they who were ordained according to the Form in our Common Prayer Books are not lookt upon by the Queen *to be ordered in very Deed*; but there is no reaſon alledged for it, nor indeed can any be given, but becauſe it was not done according to the Pontifical; an ignorance excuſable at that time, when perhaps ſhe was informed that ſomething Eſſential was left out in our Form of Orders, or that the Pontifical with its Tricks was not a new thing; whereas our Form of Ordination is more full then any of the ancient Forms, both in Subſtance & Ceremony; and therefore either the ancient Prieſts and Biſhops had no ſufficient Ordination, or Queen *Mary* was miſinformed when ſhe did not reckon Ordination by the Common Prayer book *ordering indeed.*

§ 5. Having premiſed this, I anſwer to his firſt Queſtion, *what Prieſthood or holy Orders had the firſt Reformers, but what they confeſs to have received from Roman Catholick Biſhops?* If he mean by Roman Catholick Biſhops, ſuch as own'd the Biſhop of *Rome* to be the ſupream univerſal Paſtor of the Catholick Church by Divine right, to whom themſelves were by God made unappealably accountable, which is the Eſſential Character of a *Roman* Catholick; the firſt Reformers received their Orders from no ſuch Roman Catholicks. Whatever Roman Catholicks hold now, he will never prove this to have been the declared ſence of the Church of *England* before the Reformation: and therefore the firſt Reformers cannot properly be ſaid to have received their Orders from Roman Catholicks, but from the Church of *England.*

There are two things to be diſtinguiſhed in the Office of a Biſhop; one is, the Power or Capacity of governing the Church, interpreting Scripture, Conſecrating other Biſhops, Ordaining Prieſts and Deacons, Offering, Baptizing, and Confirming: the

I desire to know, whether an honest man can preach against the Liturgie, Sacraments, or Constitution of any Church, by vertue of any Commission he received from it? Ibid.

So that no honest man can turn Presbyterian or Independant Preacher by vertue of his Protestant Mission p. 4.

The fifth Sett of Questions relating to Mission is, *Pref. pag.* 3. *Whether an Act of Parliament in* France, Spain *or* Germany, *be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in* England *for Protestancy?*

A Parliamentary Mission then our first Reformers had, and no other that I can find. p. 3.

§. 3. Before I come to a distinct consideration of each of these, I must observe that he waves the Dispute concerning our *Priestly or Episcopal Orders, whether valid or no*; (*Pamphl. pag.* 1.) Now, if these are valid, either let him shew one Sacrament *administred by Protestants*, which these Characters do not give them Power to celebrate: or one Article of Faith that they teach, which the same do not oblige them to teach: or else let him ask no more for their Mission, and Authority, to teach their Doctrine, and administer their Sacraments. If their Doctrine and Sacraments are not *Theirs* but Christs; they are not only sent, but obliged by their Orders to administer the one, and teach the other, in the Churches wherein they are appointed Pastors.

I observe further, that he manifestly contradicts himself in this matter; for he makes *Cranmer* and *Latimer the first Protestant Bishops*, and owns their Consecration (*p.*2.) and yet alledges (*p.*3) that *it is no easie matter to find out who consecrated the first Protestant Bishops*; because, forsooth, there were none to do it, *but Roman Catholick Bishops, who never use to consecrate any Protestants.* But if he had read *Mason*, and Archbishop *Bramhall*, he might have seen who ordained the first Reformers, and their Succession to this day: and if he had consulted Sir *James Ware de Præsulibus*, he might have seen that there wanted not Bishops in *Ireland* willing to consecrate Protestants; Primate *Loftus* being consecrated by the then Archbishop of *Dublin*, Dr. *Curwin*, who continued

tinued in his Archiepiſcopal See near ſix years after, and then by reaſon of his great Age was tranſlated to the Biſhoprick of *Oxford* at his own deſire. *Antiquit. Oxon. de Æde Chriſti. lib.* 2. p. 291. *Ware de præſulibus. Hib. in Archiepiſcopis Dublinienſibus*, p. 120.

Nor is the Teſtimony he produces out of *Burnet* from Queen *Mary* at all pertinent; all that appears from that Teſtimony is, that they who were ordained according to the Form in our Common Prayer Books are not lookt upon by the Queen *to be ordered in very Deed*; but there is no reaſon alledged for it, nor indeed can any be given, but becauſe it was not done according to the Pontifical; an ignorance excuſable at that time, when perhaps ſhe was informed that ſomething Eſſential was left out in our Form of Orders, or that the Pontifical with its Tricks was not a new thing; whereas our Form of Ordination is more full then any of the ancient Forms, both in Subſtance & Ceremony; and therefore either the ancient Prieſts and Biſhops had no ſufficient Ordination, or Queen *Mary* was miſinformed when ſhe did not reckon Ordination by the Common Prayer book *ordering indeed.*

§ 5. Having premiſed this, I anſwer to his firſt Queſtion, *what Prieſthood or holy Orders had the firſt Reformers, but what they confeſs to have received from Roman Catholick Biſhops?* If he mean by Roman Catholick Biſhops, ſuch as own'd the Biſhop of *Rome* to be the ſupream univerſal Paſtor of the Catholick Church by Divine right, to whom themſelves were by God made unappealably accountable, which is the Eſſential Character of a *Roman* Catholick; the firſt Reformers received their Orders from no ſuch Roman Catholicks. Whatever Roman Catholicks hold now, he will never prove this to have been the declared ſence of the Church of *England* before the Reformation: and therefore the firſt Reformers cannot properly be ſaid to have received their Orders from Roman Catholicks, but from the Church of *England.*

There are two things to be diſtinguiſhed in the Office of a Biſhop; one is, the Power or Capacity of governing the Church, interpreting Scripture, Conſecrating other Biſhops, Ordaining Prieſts and Deacons, Offering, Baptizing, and Confirming: the

other is, the admitting the Biſhop ſo impowered to the exerciſe of that Power within certain Limits, which we call a Dioceſs. The firſt of theſe is a Divine, and the ſecond a Canonical Right. Now the firſt Reformers received the firſt of theſe, that is, their Orders from Chriſt, by the hands of their Conſecrators, who were Biſhops of *England*, not *Rome*. The ſecond of theſe they received likewiſe from the Laws and Conſtitutions of the Church and Kingdom of *England*, not *Rome*: And it is to be obſerved that the Laws of the one were directly contrary to the Laws of the other, and that the Biſhops of *England* had their proper and immediate Miſſion to their Churches by an Authority maintained in oppoſition to the Popes Power, which he endeavoured as much as he could to aboliſh, but was not able; as may be ſeen in his Conteſts with *Chichely*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* in *Henry* the Sixth's time. Although therefore the firſt Reformers had their Orders from Biſhops in Communion with the Church of *Rome*; yet it was as Chriſtian Biſhops they Ordained, and as Engliſh Biſhops that they admitted the firſt Reformers to their Charges.

But ſuppoſe they had no other Orders but what they received from the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf; all that can be concluded from thence is, that we are obliged to own, that the Orders of Prieſt and Biſhop given by Roman Catholicks are valid, and capacitate a man to perform all the Duties belonging to thoſe Offices in a Chriſtian Church, which we readily acknowledge, and charge the Popiſh Prieſts and Biſhops not with want of Orders, but with abuſing the Orders they have, to ill intents and purpoſes: The Roman Catholick Biſhops do not conſer Orders as Roman, but Chriſtian Biſhops, their Orders are Chriſtian Orders, and thoſe we hold ſufficient to all intents and purpoſes of the Reformation, and muſt do ſo, till Mr. *M.* or ſome body elſe prove them inſufficient.

He objects, pag. 2. *That the firſt Reformers were Ordained Roman Catholick Biſhops, and made themſelves Proteſtants*, which proceeds on an ignorant ſuppoſition, that every man is ordained to preach the Tenents of his Ordainers, or elſe muſt have no Miſſi-

Miſſion: whereas the Ordainers are only Inſtruments, but the Power is from Chriſt; and they are no more accountable to their Ordainers upon the account of being Ordained by them, then a man is accountable to a Lord Chancellor for the uſe of his Power, becauſe he ſet the Seal to his Patent by which he claims his Power. In ſhort, a man is Ordained neither a Proteſtant nor a Papiſt but a Chriſtian Biſhop; his Miſſion is a Chriſtian Miſſion, let him be ſent by whom he will; and whoever gave him his Miſſion, if he teach any Doctrine but Chriſts, he is accurſed. Hence when the *Donatiſts* were very earneſt to know the Ordainers of St. *Auguſtine* and other Catholick Biſhops, they anſwer, *We are not ſatisfied how the cauſe of Truth is concerned, who was the Ordainer of any one; ſince God is ſhewn to be our Father.* And when they preſs ſtill to know the Ordainers, St. *Auguſtine* anſwers, *I ſee they inſiſt on trifles.*

Quid ad cauſam pertineat veritatis, uniuſcujuſq; Epiſcopi Ordinator, non ſatis agnoſcimus; Teſtimoniis divinis, pater Deus eſt edoctus. *Coll. Carthag.* 3. *Sect.* 244.

Superflua quæri video. *Sect.* 245.

'Twas on this Principle that Baptiſm and Ordination by Hereticks were allowed in the Catholick Church, even becauſe they were Baptized Chriſtian Proſelites, and Ordained Chriſtian Biſhops; and they were never thought to go beyond their Miſſion, becauſe they renounced the Errors of their Ordainers.

If it be replied, that Hereticks making themſelves, of Hereticks, Catholick Biſhops, change for the better; but Papiſts making themſelves Proteſtant Biſhops, change for the worſe. I anſwer, this quits the Plea of Miſſion, and brings the Miſſion to the trial of the Doctrine. If then *Cranmer* and the reſt of the Roman Catholick Biſhops made themſelves only truly Catholicks; they made themſelves nothing but what Chriſt had obliged them to in their Conſecration. He is the Father of Truth; the Children of Truth are owned by him as *honeſtly begotten, and no By blows*, as Mr. *M.* would inſinuate, p. 2. in which he has exactly tranſcribed not only the Argument of the Donatiſt *Petilian* againſt the Catholicks, but

his very words, The true Queſtion is therefore, whether *Cranmer* and the firſt Reformers embraced and vindicated the Truth in their Changes; and let him join Iſſue on this Point when he pleaſes, we are ready to anſwer him.

Tandem aliquando expreſſius dicat, utrum patris loco habeant Cæcilianum, ex quo deducta eſt iſta progenies, non enim poteſt aliqua res ſine generatore ſuo naſci, aut ſine capite incipere, aut ſine radice ſua creſcere. Videt igitur Nobilitas tua ſe originem non habere ſæpius poteſtatum ſi igitur originem non habet, ipſe eſt magis Hæreticus, qui non habet patrem, qui habitum patrem judicio ſuo damnavit. Aſtipuletur igitur, ut ſi criminoſum patrem ejus conſtiterit, eum crimina teneant; ſi autem innocentem, neceſſe habeat eſſe filius innocentis. *Coll. Carth.* 3 *Sect.* 236.

§ 6. To his ſecond Queſtion, *Who authorized the firſt Reformers to Teach their Proteſtant Doctrine, and Adminiſter their Proteſtant Sacraments?*

I Anſwer, No body but himſelf would have asked ſuch a fooliſh Queſtion; ſince the Proteſtants pretend to no Doctrine or Sacraments peculiar to themſelves, or that may be called Theirs, but only to the Doctrine and Sacraments of Chriſt received in the Catholick Church: If the Proteſtants were guilty of any fault, it was not making new Doctrines or Sacraments, but rejecting thoſe that ſome counted old; and ſo their Crime was not the wanting Miſſion or Authority to do what they did, but not uſing their Authority to its full extent, to do and teach more: If they had power given them to Adminiſter ſeven Sacraments and adminiſtred only two, as Mr. *M.* ſays, then it is a fooliſh thing to doubt their Authority to Miniſter thoſe two; whereas they are rather accountable for their not Holding and Adminiſtring the other five: but the truth is, they received in their Ordination power from Chriſt, to *adminiſter neither Proteſtant nor Popiſh*, but Chriſtian *Sacraments*; and Mr. *M.* neither has, nor can make it appear, that they Adminiſter any other, or omit any that Chriſt has commanded.

He is aware of this Anſwer in his fifth page, and gives a reply to it; *I pray* (ſaith he) *the Reader to remember that this was the very Anſwer of* Luther, Socinus, Zuinglius, Calvin, *and moſt other Reformers*: Let me pray the Reader to obſerve, that this is nothing

to

to the purpoſe, if it were true; ſince we are not to believe every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God. The falſe Prophets pretended to Revelation as well as the true, was neither therefore to be believed? the falſe Reformers, as well as the true, pretended to preach no new Doctrine, or adminiſter new Sacraments, but only the Doctrine and Sacraments of Jeſus Chriſt: Are neither therefore in the right? May not a good Anſwer be abuſed and miſapplyed? to clear therefore this matter, we own what he contends for, *that both true Doctrine and external and lawful Miſſion are generally neceſſary to a* regular *preacher of the Goſpel, pag.* 5. and if either of theſe are wanting, the perſon is not to be received. Which appears in the Prophets he mentions from *Jer.*23. *ibid.* who wanted not an external Miſſion, whatever Mr. *M.* imagines; for the Prophets are the Paſtors of the people, againſt whom God pronounces a wo, *verſe* 1. and 2. of that Chapter; they are joyned with the Prieſts, *verſe* the 11*th* and 34. and their fault was not preaching without any Miſſion at all, but preaching falſe Doctrine; for which no man can have a Miſſion, but even the Pope himſelf when he doth ſo, is to be rejected as a Seducer. If theſe very Prophets whom Mr. *M.* imagines to have had no Miſſion had taught true Doctrine, God would have approved them, verſe 22. *But if they had ſtood in my Councel, and cauſed my people to hear my words, then they ſhould have turned them from their evil ways*; that is, God would have given them ſucceſs: and when God ſays, verſe 32. *I ſent them not, nor commanded them,* it doth not relate to preaching, for God had commanded the Prieſts and Prophets to preach; but it relates to the cauſing *my people to err by their Lyes and Lightneſs,* which is a good Argument againſt thoſe that ſeduce the people with Legends and Lyes, and Revelations, and falſe Miracles, and Doctrines of Profit and Gain, whatever their Miſſion be.

Now theſe two things being neceſſary to a true Teacher, we affirm, that the firſt Reformers in *England* had both; not only the *Licence and Approbation of the Church,* as he ſtates it, *pag.* 15. but her Ordination and Appointment alſo according to the known rules

rules of constituting Pastors, which some other Reformers do not pretend to; and therefore all the Question is, concerning the other Character of a true Pastor, preaching true Doctrine. If the first Reformers had preached *Popish Doctrine* and administred *Popish Sacraments*, I do not find but Mr. *M.* would have thought they had Mission enough: but I Answer, that was not Christs design in appointing Bishops, but his design was that they should administer *his* Sacraments and teach *his* Doctrine. This all Bishops are impowered and obliged to do; and therefore till he shew that there is a difference between Christs Doctrine and Sacraments, and those that Protestants Teach and Administer, their Episcopal Orders are sufficient to warrant them.

§ 7. And so I proceed to his third Sett of Questions, *whether* Cranmer *and his Associates could condemn the Church of* Rome, *by pretence of the Mission received from her Bishops?* To which I answer, That if by condemning the Church of *Rome*, be meant anathematizing her, and cutting her off from the Body of Christ by a judicial Sentence, as if we were her Superiors; (which condemning only is by authority.) We never thus condemned the Church of *Rome*: Faults we believe to be in her that greatly need Reformation; but that Work we leave to her lawful Governours; our Church having declared in her Preface to her Liturgy, that *in these her doings she condemns no other Nation, nor prescribes any thing but to her own People only*; *Cranmer* therefore and his Associates did not condemn the Church of *Rome*, nor could he or his Fellows do it by pretence of a Mission received from her Bishops, for they received no Mission from her Bishops, but from the Bishops of *England*.

But then he proceeds to ask *by whose Authority did they condemn the Church from whom they received their Mission?*

To give the World an account of this matter; it is to be observed that the supream Government of our Church has always been in a National Council or Convocation of our Clergy; and that not only We but every National Church hath the same power of altering all Rites and Ceremonies, of abrogating and making

ing

ing all Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, and laſtly of reforming all Abuſes and Corruptions crept into the Church; which the ſupream Civil Power hath of altering the Civil Conſtitutions; the Fundamental Laws of Religion being preſerved inviolable in the one, and of the State in the other.

The Supream Eccleſiaſtical Power being lodged here, the next thing requiſite is a certain Rule and Method, according to which, Laws were to be paſt by it; and in the proceedings about the Reformation all alterations being made by this Power, and in this Method, it follows that they were all made legally; and that our Churches retrenching ſuch Ceremonies out of the Service of God as were judged Uſeleſs, Burdenſom, or Superſtitious; and ſuch Opinions as were no part of the Chriſtian Faith, or corrupted it, was no more to make a new Faith or Church, then to reform Abuſes in the State by Act of Parliament is to make a new Kingdom. Nor do they that thus make a Reformation any more condemn their Predeceſſors, becauſe they Reform what was amiſs in their time; then Parliament Men condemn their Anceſtors when they make a new Law.

I do confeſs *an honeſt Man cannot preach againſt the Liturgy, Sacraments, or Conſtitution of a Church by vertue of any Commiſſion from it*; and that no Church ought to be preſumed *to Authorize her Prieſts or Biſhops to go and preach the Goſpel after their private Sence or Conſcience, in contradiction to her declared Doctrine and Worſhip*; and that the *Church of* England *gives no ſuch power at this day*. But I deny this to be the caſe of the firſt Reformers, who did not act as private men in the Church when they Reformed; but as repreſenting her in her Convocation, and by her Authority. Although therefore the Church of *England* oblige private Men not to contradict her allowed Orders; yet ſhe doth not bind herſelf from making ſuch Alteration in a Canonical way, as ſhe ſees convenient, or is convinced to be neceſſary.

If therefore Mr. *M.* can ſhew, that *Cranmer* and his Aſſociates made the Alterations without conſulting her, he went indeed beyond his Commiſſion from her; but if ſhe aſſented to all he did,

and

and to this day approves the Reformation, how did *Cranmer* condemn that Church from whence he had his Miſſion?

If the Alteration was good, and thoſe things that were removed were really Errors and Corruptions, did *Cranmer* and his Aſſociates any more than what they were obliged to do by the very *Roman* Pontifical in their Ordination? *It belongs* (ſaith the Pontifical) *to a Biſhop to judge, to interpret, to conſecrate, ordain, offer, baptize and confirm.* Did they do any more? This Anſwer he owns, and aſcribes to *Burnet*, pag. 3. *The Paſtors and Biſhops of the Church are ordained to inſtruct the people in the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, according to the Scriptures; and the Nature of their Office is a ſacred Truſt that obliges them to this, and therefore if they find Errors and Corruptions in the Church, they are obliged to remove them, and undeceive the people.* Mr. *M.* would do well to anſwer, on this Suppoſition, Whether they are, or are not obliged? If they are, then they have Miſſion enough to remove, in a legal way, all Corruptions, even thoſe of their Ordainers. If they are not, how do they anſwer the Engagement made in their Orders, to teach the people according to the Scriptures? But Mr. *M.* waves any Anſwer to this, and in effect owns it, only he denys or ſeems to deny the Suppoſition; where he tells us, Cranmer *and one or two Biſhops pretended Errors and Corruptions, and drove on the Reformation againſt the major Vote of the* Engliſh *Biſhops*; p. 3. that is, he had Power and Miſſion enough, but abuſed it; and ſo to know whether *Cranmer* exceeded his Commiſſion or no, we muſt know whether the Corruptions he reformed were real or pretended. For if they were real, there is no doubt but he was obliged to reform them; none elſe being under a deeper Obligation than he. So then Mr. *M*'s Queſtion is out of doors, *Who ſent him?* and another ſubſtituted in the room thereof by himſelf; and that is, Whether there were Corruptions in the Diſcipline, Worſhip and Faith of the Church at that time? or whether

Epiſcopum oportet judicare, interpretari, conſecrare, ordinare, offerre, baptizare & confirmare. *Pontif. de Conſecrat. elect. in Epiſc.*

It is in Burnets Pref. vol. 2.

ther *He, and the other Men of Abilities were manifeſtly intoxicated with miſtakes of Holy Scripture, with a Spirit of perverſeneſs and deſire of change?* (pag 4.) And we are content to join Iſſue with him on theſe heads when he pleaſes.

But perhaps though *Cranmer* was obliged to reform what was amiſs; yet he ought to have done it in a regular way: Whereas if we believe Mr. *M. he drove on a Reformation againſt the major vote of the Engliſh Biſhops.* If by this, he means Eſtabliſhing any thing without their conſent, 'tis a moſt notorious falſhood; for in all he did, he had the unanimous vote and conſent of the major part of the Convocation, the univerſal ſubmiſſion of the Clergy, and approbation of the People. If they complyed againſt their Conſcience, then by this we may ſee how excellently the *Maſs* and *Confeſſing* had inſtructed them in the Knowledge and Conſcience of their Duty; when they ſo readily complyed with all Alterations. Let him try, if he can bring a Proteſtant Convocation to an unanimous repeal of theſe things by ſuch motives. But if the Clergy in a National Councel, and the people in obedience to them, or from their own Inclinations did comply in earneſt: what an idle Queſtion is it to ask, *By what Authority* Cranmer *condemned that Church from whom he received his Miſſion and Holy Order?* when ſhe concurred in all he did, and approved, nay, made all the Alterations in her Liturgy, Sacraments, and Conſtitutions that were made.

The true Queſtion therefore is, *Whether the Church of* England *had full power to Reform herſelf without the conſent of the* Pope? For it is into his Supremacy all this Banter of Miſſion, and indeed the whole Faith of the *Roman* Church, as diſtinct from the Catholick is reſolved. If the Church of *England* was not ſubject to the Church of *Rome*, ſhe had ſufficient Power to Reform herſelf: and the only thing for which ſhe is accountable to God, the World, and her Subjects, is the Goodneſs of the Reformation. If that was a good work, *Cranmer* did well in adviſing, and ſhe in decreeing it: but if the Errors removed by the Reformation were not real, but only pretended, as Mr. *M.* would perſwade us; (but will never be able to prove) *Cranmer* indeed was anſwerable

for giving her ill Councel; but ſhe herſelf is accountable for the removal of them, for it was her act. 'Twas by her *Authority and Miſſion*, though Mr. *M. cannot tell it*, pag. 2. that *Anno* 1549. the word Sacrament, in the ſence which the Church then gave of it, was reſtrained to Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper; and ſure the Church of *England* had Authority enough to explain her meaning, by what words ſhe thought fit. Let him ſhew if he can, that there were more Sacraments, (as ſhe underſtands the word Sacrament) ever owned in the Catholick Church, than thoſe two allowed by her.

Laſtly, to ſhew that it was not *Cranmer's* private Opinion influenced the Church; 'tis obſervable firſt that he had ſeveral private Opinions, (two whereof Mr. *M.* lays to his charge in his Preface) which were abſolutely condemned by the Church, and the contrary eſtabliſhed as her Doctrine, which he himſelf ſigned.

2*ly*. That the Biſhops and Clergy of *England* had unanimouſly entered upon the Buſineſs of the Reformation in the time of *Cranmer's* Predeceſſor Archbiſhop *Warham*, *Anno* 1531. by the Submiſſion of the Clergy to the King, and acknowledging his Supremacy: and again *Anno* 1533. by conſenting to an Act againſt Appeals to *Rome*, wherein the Nation was declared to be an intire body within it ſelf with full Power to do Juſtice in all Cauſes, Spiritual as well as Temporal. And this before *Cranmer* was Archbiſhop, ſo far was he from condemning or impoſing on the Church from whence he had his Miſſion.

§ 8. The fourth ſett of Queſtions concerning Miſſion is on this head, *whether a Presbyterian Miniſter having received Orders from a Proteſtant Biſhop can by vertue of ſuch Orders pronounce the Church of* England *a corrupt Church, or preach againſt her Sacraments or Liturgy, notwithſtanding her Cenſures?* His deſign in this Queſtion, is to ſhew that the firſt Reformers had no more Authority to preach againſt the *Romiſh* Church, then ſuch a *Presbyter* has to preach againſt our Church: *I cannot underſtand how a man can forſake the Church of* England, *and preach Presbyterian Doctrine*

ſtrine by vertue of his Proteſtant Miſſion; nor conſequently how any man can juſtifie his Proteſtant Doctrine by vertue of his Popiſh Miſſion. pag. 2.

Why may not a Presbyterian, having the ſame Authority of Scripture which Cranmer *pretended to, preach againſt the Superſtition of the* Common Prayer, *as well as he againſt the Idolatry of the* Maſs? p. 6. and more to the ſame purpoſe, p. 12.

In Anſwer to this, I will ſhew firſt, why a Presbyter or Biſhop, ought not to preach againſt the conſtitution of the Church whereof he is a Member in contradiction to her Cenſures. And ſecondly, that this was not the firſt Reformers caſe.

1. A Presbyter or Biſhop ought not to preach againſt the Conſtitution of the Church of which they are Members: Becauſe there is a regular way in which they may endeavour a Reformation. If they find any thing amiſs in her Diſcipline or Doctrine, they may make their Application for redreſs of it to thoſe that have power to reform it; but muſt not preſume being Subjects to uſurp their Governours Power: For this is the caſe of private mens reforming abuſes in the State in ſpight of the King; a remedy generally worſe then the diſeaſe. However in both Caſes private men may ſue for Redreſs, and in their proper Stations endeavour it. But if ſuch a Biſhop or Presbyter be *cenſured* and Suſpended, he is thereby diſcharged from the Execution of his Office, and he muſt no more make a Schiſm to regain it, then one muſt make a Rebellion in the ſtate to regain a civil Office. this we urge, and I think with reaſon againſt the Presbyterians and other Sects amongſt us, that either have no Ordination or Appointment to their Offices from the Church of *England* and *Ireland*, or elſe abuſe the Power againſt her, which was once given them by her, and from which they are again legally ſuſpended.

And as we urge this againſt them, ſo likewiſe againſt Mr. *M.* and his party, who without any Miſſion from theſe Churches, do according to their private ſence take a Commiſſion from a Foreign Biſhop and Church, to preach againſt the declared Doctrine of that Church, to which by the Law of Chriſt they are Subjects.

Them we count those *Rebels*, who when censured and condemned by their own Churches and Governors, against all the known Laws of our Church, flee from her Tribunal, and appeal to Foreigners. And what *Rebels or Hereticks will ever be convicted*, (*p* 4.) if they may choose their own Judges, as these do? We do not deny the Orders of the Church of *Rome*; we own that she can make Priests and Bishops, but let Mr. *M.* shew that the *Pope* could ever give them Power to Exercise their Office in these Kingdoms; since it is directly against the ancient Laws and Practice observed and enacted by our Ancestors, and in force at the Reformation. If a man like not the Orders therefore of his own Church he must be without Orders, except he would be a Schismatick and Deserter, as Mr. *M.* has made himself.

2. And this is sufficient to shew that the case of the first Reformers was vastly different from the case of the present Dissenters, which is the second thing I am to prove. The whole strength of Mr. *M*'s Paper doth really depend on this parallel, and whoever reads it will find that the only considerable Argument he produces, is, that the first Reformers Mission could not be good, because the Presbyterians have as much to say for *Theirs*: And that he can find no difference between these two, only that the *first Reformers were Authorized by Act of Parliament*. I have heard it given as the Character of wit, that it finds out the likeness of things; whereas it is the work of Judgement to find out the differences: Now Mr. *M.* having (whatever his Judgment may be) a great wit, no wonder if he could find no other difference between those two cases. His Wit could serve him to find the likeness between the *Presbyterians* Case and Ours, but his Judgment doth not serve him to find the Difference. Now, if he had been very inquisitive, he might have been informed in this by one of the late *London* Cases, printed for *Thomas Bassett*, *London*, 1683. and writen purposely to shew this Difference; and 'tis a wonder that Mr *M.* whose study lay much in Pamphlets mist it. If he saw it, he ought to have shown those Differences there assigned to be none, before he parallelled the Cases. But to help his understanding

derſtanding I will ſhew three material Differences, beſides that of an Act of *Parliament*; and beſides the truth of the Doctrine, which was really on the Reformers ſide, and is only pretended to by Diſſenters.

1. In the condition of the Perſons that pretended to Reform.

2*ly*. In the manner of their proceeding.

And 3*ly*. In the Principles they took for their Rule.

Firſt, Therefore there is a great difference in the condition of the firſt Reformers, and the preſent Diſſenters; theſe being only private perſons, at the beſt *Presbyters* overvoted by the major part of their Brethren: Whereas the firſt Reformers were Biſhops and the chief Governors of the Church; who had a Canonical as well as Parliamentary Miſſion, and to which of right it did belong to Govern and Reform the Church, over whom they were made Overſeers by the Holy Ghoſt. Furthermore, the preſent Diſſenters were the Biſhops Subjects, accountable to them as their Superiors, and lyable to be diſcharged from their Office, and the benefits of the Communion of the Church by their Cenſure; and ſo their Seperation from their Biſhops is a Schiſm; that is, an Eccleſiaſtical Rebellion: But the firſt Reformers were accountable to no Superior but Jeſus Chriſt; they were his immediate Vicars, not the Pope's; and therefore could not be guilty of any Rebellion againſt him.

2. And as they were thus different in their condition, ſo they were likewiſe in the manner of their Proceedings; for the firſt Reformers did ſtrictly forbid private perſons doing any thing of their own head, as may be ſeen by the Proclamation ſet out *Feb. 6. Ed. 6. Anno* 2. and accordingly they managed the whole matter by publick Authority in a Regular way, according to the ancient Forms of paſſing Laws and making Alterations in the Church. Whereas both *Presbyterians* and *Papiſts*; that is, all Diſſenters, proceed on their own Heads in ſpight of their Lawful Governours. Let a *Presbyterian* take the ſame way to remove the pretended *Superſtition of the Common Prayer book* that the firſt

Re-

Reformers took to remove the *Idolatry of the Maſs*; or let the *Papiſts* take the ſame way to Eſtabliſh the *Maſs* that our firſt Reformers took to Aboliſh it, and do it, if they can: But if they will make uſe of another way never allowed in the Church, and yet pretend to the ſame Power that the Biſhops of *England* had, he muſt be blind that doth not ſee the vanity of their pretences.

Mr. *M.* obſerves well, *that the not conſidering this matter hath brought a world of Confuſion on theſe Kingdoms, and till the people underſtand it, we are never like to ſee an end of Religious diſtractions*; (pag. 6.) for while men *without ordinary Miſſion* from the Governours of a Church, or *without extraordinary Miſſion teſtified by miracle*, ſhall be received by the people upon pretence they are ſent by a Foreign Church, or that the people themſelves can declare them Commiſſionated by Chriſt, which are the pretences of *Papiſts* and *Diſſenters*; what more peace can be hoped for in the Church, then in a State where ſuch things were allowed to be practiced? Why may not the *Presbyterians* reſiſt their Lawful Governours, as well as the *Papiſts* deny their Power, and queſtion their Succeſſion though they have none to oppoſe to it?

The third difference between the *Diſſenters* caſe in reſpect of Us, and our caſe in reſpect of *Papiſts* is in the Principles on which our firſt Reformers proceeded. They did not pretend as he ſlanders them in his Preface *to juſtifie their Separation* (for they never made any) *by the Scriptures only as interpreted by themſelves, not only without, but againſt the Authority of the preſent Catholick Church.* For on the contrary, except he mean by the Catholick Church the particular Church of *Rome*, and her adherents, the Catholick Church was for the Reformers, as they conceived; and the greater part of viſible Chriſtians concurred with them in their ſence of Scripture, as to the moſt material controverſies between our Church and *Rome*. But the true Principles of the Reformation were ſuch as theſe, that the Catholick Faith ought to be always the ſame in all Ages, and could not receive Additions or grow by time; that nothing ſhould be an Article of Faith to day that was not yeſterday; and therefore nothing was to be

be reckoned as Catholick Faith, but what was received *ſemper, ubique & ab omnibus*, according to *Vincentius*'s Rule; and that nothing was thus Catholick, but what might be proved by Scripture taken in that ſence which hath not been contradicted by Catholick Fathers. Theſe were the principles of the Reformers Faith.

And in other things belonging to the Government and Polity of the Church, to Rites, Ceremonies, and Liturgies: 'Twas their principle, that every National Church was at her own choice, how ſhe would order them; and her Subjects ow'd her Obedience. Theſe are truly Catholick Principles founded on a Rock, the word of God interpreted by Catholick Tradition, and not on the preſent Sentiments of any party of men, and are a ſufficient hedge againſt Hereſie and Schiſm, ſufficient to ſecure the good correſpondence of neighbouring, and the peace of particular Churches. Let any one compare this *Baſis* with that of the *Roman* Faith, and let him judge which is moſt ſolid; whether that which is founded on the Scriptures as interpreted by all ages of the Church, or that which has only *the Voice* of a part of the *Viſible Church*, and the greater part againſt it. Theſe are the *two Baſes* of the Reformation and Papery.

To this Juſtification no Sectary can pretend, and though *Luther* and *Calvin*, &c. had really this warrant to reject the ſuper-added Articles of the Church of *Rome*, yet they differed in this, at leaſt ſome of them, that they did not think it neceſſary to wait the concurrence of their Governours, but concluded the major part of the Peoples joyning with them was ſufficient, without regular Forms and Proceſs: and whether that may be allowed in any caſe I leave Mr. *M.* and them to diſpute, for we are not concerned in it, and they are of full Age to anſwer for themſelves, and he will find they can do it.

Only he is not to be pardoned when he brings in *Socinus* anſwering amongſt other Reformers, that *he preached no new Doctrine, nor adminiſtred any new Sacrament; but only the Primitive Doctrine*, &c. *according to the ſence of the ancient Fathers*, pag. 5.

which

which plainly ſhews that he knew nothing of *Socinus* his Opinions or Principles, who * poſitively denied the neceſſity of Baptiſm; and † proteſted againſt being judged by that ſence the Fathers or the Primitive Church have given of Scriptures.

* Socinus de Baptiſmo. Vol. 1.

† Socinus Reſ. ad 11. Cap. Vujeki Claſſ 7. Arg 5.

Theſe are ſufficient to ſhew the vaſt difference between the pretences of the preſent Diſſenters, and the grounds of our Reformation. And that the Argument he draws from the Obligation in Ordination layd on the Presbyters of our Church, *to miniſter the Doctrine and Sacraments as this Church and Realm have received the ſame according to the Commandments of God*, pag. 4. is of no force againſt the firſt Reformers; though it obliged Mr. *M.* not to deſert our Church; and the Nonconformiſts not to preach in contradiction to her declared Doctrine and Worſhip.

§. 9. And ſo I proceed to his fifth Query: *Whether an Act of Parliament in* France, Spain, *or* Germany, *be not as good an authority for Popery there, as in* England *for Proteſtancy?*

I ſuppoſe by an Act of Parliament, he means the Laws enacted regularly by the Supream Powers of thoſe Nations, (which he ignorantly expreſſes by an Act of Parliament) and to this I anſwer, That if any Religion is to be eſtabliſhed in any Kingdom by temporal Rewards or Puniſhments, to encourage the Obedient, and terrifie the Diſobedient; the Supream Powers of every Nation only can thus eſtabliſh that Religion; and they themſelves are ſole Judges with what temporal Rewards and Puniſhments, and how far they will eſtabliſh it: and they are anſwerable only to God for their actings herein. If therefore the Supream Civil Government in *France* or *Spain* ſet up Popery, a Man muſt ſubmit to it, or burn for it, if the Law be ſo: and ſuch a Law, though it is unjuſt, is as forceable for a falſe Religion as a true.

But there is another way of eſtabliſhing a Religion, and that is by convincing Mens Minds that the Religion is true; and that, according as men cordially embrace it, they ſhall bo ſecured of the Divine Favor and be happy in the next World. And if

this

this be the Christian Religion of which they are so convinced, one Principle of it is, that the Professors thereof ought to associate themselves into a Body, and that Christ the Author thereof has appointed Governors who are to descend in Succession; and that to these, regularly appointed, a due Obedience is to be paid, as Men value the Rewards or Punishments of the next life. Now Men, thus perswaded, cannot think an Act of the Civil Governors alone, a sufficient Commission for any one to undertake the Function of a Spiritual Pastor, any more then an Act of these Spiritual Pastors is sufficient to capacitate and commissionate a Man to discharge a Civil Function: and therefore Mr. *M.* argues very unnecessarily against the Parliaments Power *to preach or administer Sacraments*, pag. 3. since the 27*th* Article of our Church denies expresly that Power to the Civil Governors. I suppose I have sufficiently shewn that our first Reformers had a Canonical as well as Parliamentary Mission, and I suppose that this Canonical Mission is nothing the less valid, because the other goes along with it.

But then it may be objected; Have not *France* and *Spain* an Act of the Church, as well as State, for establishing their Religion? I answer, they have; and so has Mahometism in *Turkey* an Act of what they count the Church for its establishment. And therefore it is not sufficient that the Power that establishes a Religion be competent; and the Methods regular by which it is settled: but likewise it is necessary that the Religion be true in it self: and therefore a Man must examine whether the Christian Religion be more purely & truly taught and established in *England*, or in *Spain*, before he either reject or embrace the one or the other. For a false Religion may have all the regular settlements that a true can have; and the Professors thereof being conscious of its weakness, are often more industrious to make the accidental security the stronger. and I do affirm that there is not one Argument in this Paper urged by Mr. *M* against Protestants, but might with equal advantage be urged *mutatis mutandis* against convert Christians in a Mahometan Country; and this alone is sufficient to shew them all to be

inconclusive. The way therefore for every man to be satisfied in his Religion is to examine it a part from the accidental advantages of it, and choose that which has best reasons to recommend it: for a man ought to choose his Church by his Religion, and not his Religion by his Church.

But he asks *in case there be no judge to determine who have the true sence of Scripture, Roman Catholicks or Protestants, whether the Catholick sence be not as good as the Protestants?* (Pref. *p* 3.) It were a sufficient Answer to this, to put another case like it to him in the person of a *Turk*: And it is this, in case there is no Judge to determine, (as I know of none, saith the *Turk*,) which is the Word of God, the *Bible*, or the *Alchoran*. Why should not the Affirmation of us *Mussulmans*, (who are all ready to vouch to the death for the *Alchoran*, and are twice the number of you *Christians*,) be as good authority for Men to believe the *Alchoran* came from God, as your vouching for your *Bibles* is sufficient to perswade men to believe that they came from him.

But I do not love to shift off a Question, and therefore tell him that the sence put by *Roman* Catholicks on the Scripture, is not so good as the sence put on them by the Protestants. If it were; they would not be afraid to put it to the World, and let every person that is equally concerned judge for himself: but they had rather appeal to themselves as Judges, and then they are sure of the cause.

But then he tells us, *that he could never understand what Unity of Spirit, or agreement in Faith Christians are like to have,* (page 3.) upon these Principles.

To which I Answer, more then they have now. If National Churches were left to be govern'd by themselves, and the Subjects of each Church bound to adhere to their immediate Governors in all quarrels with Neighbouring Churches, those contentions must soon come to an end, as the quarrel between St. *Cyprian* and *Stephen* did. For when the Governours of differing Churches find that they cannot hurt one another, or advantage themselves by denyal of Communion; (as it must be when the one Church doth not raise a Faction to side with it in the other) the quarrel must soon

ſoon ceaſe; for the thing that make quarrels endleſs is intereſt. But if it once be counted Lawful for one Church to get a party in the others Precincts, and ſet up Altar againſt Altar in the ſame place, this will continue the Schiſm, and is the very fundamental reaſon of the breaches of Charity amongſt Chriſtians that now peſter Chriſtendom, which are much worſe than Diviſions in Faith. And thus I have Anſwered all his Queſtions, and conſidered all the Replies he made to theſe Anſwers he himſelf was pleaſed to obſerve, which were the two firſt things I undertook on this head.

§ 10. I ſhall in the third place conſider the objections he makes againſt the Reformers as to their Lives and Principles. If I had a mind to ſhuffle as he does, I would Anſwer with him, *pag.* 13. *As for the ill Practices of ſome, and the ill Opinions of other* Reformers, *which* Papiſts *are wont to charge upon the* Reformation, *I paſs them over as no Argument at all. In our* Articles and Canons *an unprejudiced Reader ſhall find nothing but what is judicious and pious.* But his ſlanders are ſo malicious that they ought not to be paſt over without Animadverſion.

Firſt therefore againſt *Sommerſet* and *Dudley*, whom he calls *grand Reformers*, he objects *Sacriledge and Plundering the Church.* But as for *Dudley*, we are not obliged to defend him: he was a falſe Brother; being as he profeſſed at his death always a Papiſt in his heart: and no wonder ſuch Villains ſhould pervert the moſt innocent deſign to their own advantage; ſince there was a *Judas* even among the Apoſtles, who minded only the Bag. *Sommerſet* was not clear from the ſame vice. But it is to be conſidered that the Pope had taught them all this Leſſon by his example and wicked management of the Goods of the Church. 'Twas he firſt gave the proper Patrimony of the Church, even Tithes to Lay-men, to uſeleſs and idle Monks and Fryers; it was he that by making a trade of Simony and Sacriledge took off men's veneration for Holy things, and made Noble Men believe that Eſtates were as well beſtowed in their hands as to enrich a Forreigner. Whoever reads our Chronicles will find this to be

the true ground of the Dilapidation of the Goods of the Church, and that this took off the Conſcience of Robbing her.

As for *Cranmer* and the Biſhops, they did what they could to hinder it, but were forced to *buy* God's *truth* and the eſtabliſhment thereof at the rate of ſome of their wordly Goods; a bargain Mr. *M.* would never have made, nor any one that values the Church only for her outward ſplendour. But the Reformers hearts were not ſo full of the World, and yet they never eſtabliſhed one Article or Canon that allows Sacriledge.

§ 12. But he proceeds and objects againſt *Cranmer*: 1. his *Opinions*, 2. his *Recantation*, 3. his *Treaſon*, 4. his *Divorcing Queen* Catherine, 5. his *Deſtroying Religious Houſes, and hanging up poor Abbots*, 6. *Setting the people a madding after New Lights*, and 7. *All the Confuſion and Miſchiefs that have ſince broke out upon the Stage of* Great Britain.

1. *Cranmer's* Opinions: In his Preface Mr. *M.* objects to him that he ſaid *by the Scriptures no Conſecration is neceſſary to a Prieſt or Biſhop; only Appointment*: and then, that the power of Excommunication *depended only on the Laws of the Land*: but he doth not obſerve that *Cranmer* did only humbly propoſe theſe, and did not define them, as may be ſeen expreſly in his Subſcription; nay, upon better information, retracted them, as appears by his ſigning Dr. *Leighton's* Opinion to the contrary. I confeſs it looks like a providence that *Cranmer* ſhould embrace ſome of theſe Opinions: For by this it plainly appears that he did not influence the Reformation ſo much as to make his private Opinions paſs for the Doctrine of the Church, as ſome have with confidence enough pretended; and Mr. *M.* amongſt the reſt, who doth diſſemble (or conſidering his reading doth probably not know) the original of theſe miſtakes in *Cranmer*, and ſome others at that time, concerning the diſtinction of Civil & Eccleſiaſtical Power, which was this; The Pope had made a confuſion of the Civil & Spiritual Power, by aſſuming to himſelf the erecting Kingdoms, tranſferring Rights, diſpencing with Oaths, and depoſing Princes: of all which there were freſh inſtances at that time; particularly, the

depoſing

depoſing *Henry* VIII. and abſolving his Subjects from their Allegiance by *Paul* III. This having confounded the two Powers; no wonder that men could not on a ſudden clear their eyes ſo as exactly to ſee the limits; or if *Cranmer*, being well aſſured of the Popes uſurpation, did on the other hand at firſt give too much to the Prince; which yet on ſecond thoughts, finding himſelf ſingular in it, he recalled, and joined with the reſt in ſubſcribing the publick Doctrine directly contrary to his former private Opinion. *Burnet*'s firſt volume, *Addenda, page* 327.

Whereas the Pope the head of Mr. *M*'s Church was in as great an Error as *Cranmer*, and for which there was leſs ground, and yet neither He nor his Succeſſors have retracted it to this day. Let the World judge of the diſcretion of this man who forſakes a Church, becauſe one of the Reformers had an odd opinion, which he Retracted, and eſtabliſhed the contrary in the Church; and yet joins with a Church; whoſe Head at the ſame time profeſſed and impoſed as great an Error, and which ſtands yet unrecanted.

§ 13. The ſecond Objection againſt *Cranmer*, is his *Recantation for fear of Death*; but let the World conſider whether he or they that put him to that fear for his Religion were moſt guilty: and let Mr. *M.* ſay, whether he be ſo ſure of his conſtancy in his new Religion, that he would be contented to be counted a Villain, if fear of death ſhould make him deſert it; and then why ſhould not he allow ſomething to humane frailty?

§ 14. But he Objects in the third place, that *Cranmer ſubſcribed a Letter for the Excluſion of his Lawful Princeſs:* But whoever reads the Hiſtory will find that he was brought with greater difficulty then any to ſubſcribe to her Excluſion, and not till after the King, the whole Privy-Councel, and Judges had ſigned it; this then was a point of Law in which he was not ſingular. Mr. *M.* takes the liberty to queſtion Queen *Elizabeth*'s Title, and ſure it was no greater fault in *Cranmer* to queſtion Queen *Mary*'s after the Opinion of the Judges given againſt her. There is great difference between Rebellion againſt a King of undoubted Title; and

and being engaged on a ſide where the Title is really doubtful. The firſt is a great wickedneſs, and the laſt a great infelicity.

§ 15. His fourth Objection is the *Divorcing Queen Catherine*; but it was not only *Cranmer*'s Opinion, but the opinion of moſt learned Men in *Europe*, that her Marriage to the King was null. How *vertuous or innocent* ſoever Mr. *M.* reckons her; *Cranmer* was in the right when he and all the Biſhops of *England* ſo judged it. The ſcruple was firſt raiſed in the King by the Ambaſſadors of *Spain*, and further confirmed by thoſe of *France* before any intrigue with *Ann Boleyn*.

§ 16. His fifth Objection is *diſſolving Religious Houſes and Hanging up the Abbots*.

As to his diſſolving Religious Houſes, if his Councel had been taken, it had turned to the advantage of Religion and the Kingdom, and I do not find that either have loſt by it as it is. As for his Hanging up the Abbots, this is one of *Sanders*'s lyes tranſcribed by *Heylin*, in his Hiſtory, who tells us of the *Executing of ſome Abbots and other Religious Perſons for their ſtiffneſs, (if I may not call it perverſeneſs) in oppoſing the Kings deſires*: But this is confuted by *Burnet*. Who ſhews that the Abbots were attainted neither for *ſtiffneſs* nor *perverſeneſs*, but downright actual Rebellion, that is taking Arms againſt their Soveraign, or ſending Mony to thoſe that did.

ad An. pag 9. 1537.

ad An. 1538. v. 1. pag 236.

§ 17. Sixthly, His *ſetting people a madding after New Lights*; that is, he allowed people the uſe of their Eyes and Ears, and did not think Ignorance the Mother of Devotion, or that peoples Devotion or Religion was more acceptable to God, becauſe they did not underſtand it; of any other ſetting people a madding after New Lights, *Cranmer* never was Guilty: And thus Chriſtianity ſet the World near 1700 years ago a madding, and was accuſed by the Heathen for it.

§ 18. But he objects, laſtly, *That* Cromwel *and* Cranmer *were the Ringleaders of all that Confuſion and Miſchief, which has ſince broke out on the ſtage of* Britain.

This

This is to charge them home, and would do their work in earneſt, if true; but the beſt of it is, that it wants Proof and Truth: for the Times ſince the Reformation have been as ſignal for Piety and Juſtice, as any like tract of time before, and bleſſed with the longeſt and moſt flouriſhing Peace that, perhaps, ever was ſeen in *England* for the ſpace of, at leaſt, 80 years, in which it was carried to the higheſt pitch of Glory that ever it reached.

And beſides all this, many Confuſions and Miſchiefs that happened ſince in theſe Kingdoms proceeded clearly from other hands. Pray, were *Cranmer* and *Cromwel* the Ringleaders of *Tyrones* Wars? and of the Maſſacre of the Proteſtants in 1641? which were the greateſt Confuſions in *Ireland* ſince the Reformation. Were they the Ringleaders of Four Rebellions in *Henry* the Eighth's time? of the Four in *Edward* the Sixth's, or the Rebellion and Plots in Queen *Elizabeths*? Theſe were nevertheleſs ſome of the Confuſions ſince on the ſtage of *Britain*.

But a great many Sects have riſen ſince, of which the Reformation was the occaſion, if we believe Mr. *M.* I anſwer, Chriſtianity was the cauſe of as many, and the Grace of God it ſelf was abuſed. But it is to be obſerved, that the firſt Sect that opened the Gap, and introduced all the reſt was POPERY, planted amongſt us by the Emiſſaries of *Rome*. Theſe broke the Hedge, and ſhewed the way of Separation; others only imitated them, and tranſcribed their Practices and Principles, thinking they might as well teach men by their own Authority, as by a Foreign Commiſſion; and it is like, that ſuch as favour them now, ſet them on at firſt, purpoſely to make them a Clog and Objection to the Reformation.

Two means we do own, Papiſts have to prevent Sects, that we want, Ignorance and the Inquiſition; in a profound Ignorance, as in a dark night all things are ſilent; but there will be a buſtle and ſtir among men, while the Sun ſhines. And for the Inquiſition, it is *the true Ram to beat down Hereſie, and defend the Apoſtolick See*; if we believe *Paul* IV. Hiſt. Concil. Trident. ad an. 1558.

But

But we beg His Holineſs's Pardon; we had rather ſuffer all our Sects, if they were more, than admit theſe Remedies; which after all are not effectual, as we may ſee from the new Sects in *Italy*; and we cannot think thoſe the only fit means to prevent Diviſions in Chriſtianity, which may as well be applied to keep it out, and preſerve Union amongſt Infidels.

CHAP. III.

§ 1. AND now I come to the ſecond Point, wherein Mr. *M.* was diſſatisfied, which he tells us, was *the Want of Confeſſion to a Prieſt.*

There is ſo little looks like Reaſon on this Head, that it is harder to find out what he intends for Argument in it; than to anſwer it. I will do him juſtice, and conſider even that little he has ſaid. And that in this method.

1. I will lay down the Doctrine of our Church concerning Confeſſion. How far ſhe declares it neceſſary, and how far expedient only: from whence it will appear, that Confeſſion is not wanting in her.

2. I will conſider what he has produced in favour of its neceſſity, or expediency.

The firſt of theſe ſeems neceſſary to be handled; becauſe he tells us, that he *divers times diſcourſed with Proteſtant Miniſters, and ſome Proteſtant Biſhops, about this matter; and was ſorry to find no Harmony in their Opinions.* p. 6. Now let us ſuppoſe it were true, that private men differ'd in their Opinions about ſome matters relating to Confeſſion; yet it were nothing to the purpoſe: at leaſt, it could be no reaſonable motive to go from us to the Church of *Rome*, ſince her private Doctors differ as much about it. Some of which ſay, that the Prieſt ought to take the Penitents word, and grant him Abſolution; although he do not believe his profeſſion of Repentance to be ſincere. Others hold, that the Confeſſor ought to be ſatisfied of the Penitents ſincerity before

before he abſolve him. Some ſay *Attrition* with Abſolution is ſufficient to obtain Remiſſion of Sins; others ſay *Contrition* is neceſſary; which is as material a difference as almoſt can be. Many ſuch differences there are amongſt them, and the one party accuſes the other of Hereſie for their differing Opinions; and yet it ſeems this want of Harmony amongſt the *Roman* Doctors and Biſhops did not hinder Mr. *M.* from embracing their Religion. It was therefore very partially done to leave Our Church for a pretended difference amongſt our Doctors: For let us take the Difference as he repreſents it, and it is really no more. *Some ſaid 'twas a thing allowed by the Church of* England *as very expedient in ſome Caſes, but no matter of neceſſity; others thought it but a Picklock of Secrets, and a matter of ill conſequence.* Methinks there is a very good Harmony between theſe, and that the ſame Men might have ſaid both: at leaſt the Opinions are eaſily reconciled, ſince both agree that in all caſes *it is no matter of neceſſity*; and neither deny, *that in ſome caſes it is very expedient:* Notwithſtanding which it may be in other caſes, *but a Pick lock of Secrets, and matter of ill conſequence.* Where is the diſagreement or contradiction between theſe two? To give Mr. *M.* back one of his own Arguments, *for my part I do not underſtand it.*

§ 2. I have read a great many Proteſtant Books, and conſulted both Divines and Biſhops; and do profeſs that I have found them very well agreed in theſe things.

First, That every Sinner ought to be heartily ſenſible of every Sin he has committed, and acknowledge it before God with ſhame and ſorrow; and that he can expect no Pardon from God till he actually abhor and forſake the Sin. Wherever Confeſſion is mentioned in Scripture, it is to be underſtood of this kind of Confeſſion; except the Circumſtances manifeſtly determine the ſence otherwiſe. This Confeſſion alone was ſufficient to obtain Remiſſion of Sins under the Old Law, *Pſal.* 32. 5. without Auricular Confeſſion to a Prieſt.

2. It is neceſſary to Confeſs and Acknowledge ſuch Sins as injure our Neighbours, not only to God, but likewiſe to the injured

person; where that Confession may be an Advantage or Satisfaction to him. Restitution must also go along with Confession, if it be possible: If the injured person, or they who have a title to what was his, are not to be found; the Restitution is to be made to God for some Charitable use, according to the advice of the Priest. This case is thus determined by God himself, *Lev.* 6. *Numb.* 5. and by Our Church in her Exhortation to the Communion.

3. Where a Sin is notorious or publick, in as much as the Church is injured by it, and the Fact falls under her Cognizance and Jurisdiction, she may call the Sinner to an account, oblige him to make publick Confession of his Guilt, and to submit to such Disciplines as she judges most probable to Reform him. Her Sentence of Absolution is necessary to a person thus called to an account by her, where it may be had; neither can he be absolved from his Sin without submitting to her Orders. This appears to be the sence of our Church, from the Rubrick to the Communion and 33. Article.

4. Where there is any doubt or scruple in a Man's mind concerning the nature of an Action, whether it be good or evil; concerning his own Repentance, whether it be sincere and sufficient; or concerning the means and way to attain to this true Repentance: In these and the like cases the Sinner is obliged to repair to his Spiritual Guide for his Resolution, Counsel and Direction. This is commanded by Our Church in the Exhortation that gives warning for the Communion.

5. Where the sence of Guilt lyes heavy on the Conscience of a Sinner, so that there is danger of his being swallowed up by too much Grief; he who finds his Spirit thus wounded is required to have recourse to his Spiritual Physician; that *by the Ministry of Gods word, he may receive the benefit of Absolution.* As Our Church has expresst it in her Exhortation, whose words Mr. *M.* has corrupted (that he might find an occasion to cavil,) first by alledging this *Proviso* as hers in the matter of Confession; *if a Man be troubled with any doubts or scruples*; whereas she uses no such

words, either *in her Office for Communion, or Visitation of the Sick*: which are the two places he alledges for them. And Secondly, by leaving out these words, *but* if any one *requires farther comfort or counsel*, in this following Sentence; *If there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own Conscience herein*, but requires farther comfort or counsel: *let him come to Me, or some other discreet and learned Minister, and open his grief.* Where the words he has left out make her sence plain, that she requires men to come to a Priest, not only in cases of Scruples and Doubts, but likewise of Grief from the sence of Guilt: and that she proposes Advice and Counsel as a remedy for the one, and Absolution as a remedy for the other. Which clearly destroys Mr. *M*'s surmise; as if *Confession* in our Church were for *nothing else but to be resolved in our Scruples and Doubts.*

6. Confession to a Priest, even of secret Sins, is counted with us an act of Mortification, and of great uses in most cases: as it is of great use and safety to consult a Physician at any time when one finds himself sick: this is prescribed by the 19*th* Canon of the Church of *Ireland*. It is counted a great Wickedness for the Priest to reveal any such Confession. And it is forbidden *under the pain of irregularity*, by the 64. Canon.

7. It is not necessary by any Divine Command, that a man should discover every Sin to a Priest, though he may be had, any more than it is necessary every time a man is sick to send for a Physician. And therefore Auricular Confession is not the only way for obtaining Pardon of Sins committed after Baptism.

From these things, in which our Bishops and Divines are all agreed, though Mr. *M.* slanders them for want *of harmony*, it appears, that neither publick nor private Confession is wanting in our Church, and it can no more be said that Confession to a Priest is wanting in her; because she doth not oblige all People to it under penalty of Damnation, then a City can be said to want Water, where the Fountains are full and open, only because Men are not obliged under pain of Death to use them.

If therefore Mr. *M.* means any thing when he professes himself

diſſatisfied with the want of Confeſſion to a Prieſt; he muſt mean, the want of a Law to oblige all men who hope for pardon of any ſin, to confeſs it in particular to the Prieſt, and receive his Abſolution for it. We muſt own that we have no ſuch Law in our Church. But the reaſon of that want is, becauſe neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles left us any ſuch.

§ 3. It was incumbent on him, before he left our Church on that account, to produce this Law, and ſhew Confeſſion to be otherwiſe neceſſary then as is taught and practiſed by her. Let us therefore examine what he has ſaid on this head.

And here the only thing produced by him for the neceſſity of Confeſſion to a Prieſt, which looks like an Argument, is contained in theſe words, p. 7. *If we confeſs our Sins, God is faithful and juſt to forgive us our Sins*, ſaith St. *John*. *Faithful and Juſt, to what? even to his own promiſe which he hath thrice repeated in the Goſpel; whoſoevers Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; but other promiſe that he will do it without the Miniſtry of his Prieſts, we read not in the New Teſtament.*

In anſwer to this Argument, I will ſhew, 1. That the words *If we confeſs our Sins*, do not concern Confeſſion to a Prieſt. 2. When God is ſaid to be *Faithful and Juſt*, it doth not particularly reſpect that Promiſe, *John* 20. 23. *Whoſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.* 3. If it did reſpect this Promiſe, and the *Miniſtry of a Prieſt* were granted to be abſolutely neceſſary to the pardon of Sins; yet it would not follow that Auricular Confeſſion were neceſſary.

§ 4. Firſt, the words of St. *John*, 1 Ep. 1. 9. *If we confeſs our ſins*, do not concern Confeſſion to a Prieſt: but were deſigned by the Apoſtle to oblige every man to acknowledge and confeſs that he is a ſinner, and that he needs Repentance and the Blood of Chriſt for his ſalvation; which will appear from the occaſion and circumſtances of this place. I think it is agreed that St. *John* wrote theſe words in oppoſition to the Diſciples of *Simon Magus*, who taught, as St. *Irenæus* informs us, that ſuch *as were perfect among them*, and

St. Iren. lib. 1. cap 1. p. 29. *Paris* 1579.

and had that Principle they called *Salt and Light* could not ſin: Not but that they were guilty of the greateſt villanies; but they reckoned nothing in themſelves ſin, becauſe they walked in *Light* and *Truth*, while the reſt of the world were in *Darkneſs*, as they pretended. In oppoſition to theſe, St. *John* ſhews us, *v.* 8. that if we pretend thus to be without *ſin, we deceive our ſelves and the truth is not in us:* but if we own and acknowledge our ſins, and heartily endeavour to avoid them; then the Blood of Chriſt cleanſes us from all ſin, according to Gods promiſe, who *gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believes in him might not periſh.* It is plain, from verſ. 10. that ſuch as refuſed to confeſs their ſins, according to St. *John, made God a lyar.* Now this is litterally true of thoſe who deny that they are ſinners, as thoſe Hereticks did: but to deny the neceſſity of a particular enumeration of ſins to a Prieſt, doth no ways impeach Gods truth: and therefore the Confeſſion required by theſe words, *if we confeſs our ſins* is not Auricular.

This is farther manifeſt from the antient Fathers of the Church, not one of which underſtand theſe words of Confeſſion to a Prieſt.

St. *Auguſtine* has written a Comment on this Epiſtle, and he thus explains this place. *If thou confeſs that thou art a ſinner, the truth is in thee —— Tell men what thou art; tell God what thou art. If thou tell not God what thou art, God will damn what he finds in thee. If thou wouldſt not that he ſhould damn, condemn thou.*

Ergo ſi te confeſſus fueris peccatorem, eſt in te veritas. —— dic hominibus quid es, dic Deo quid es. Quia ſi non dixeris Deo damnet Deus, quod in te inveniat. *Aug. Tract. 1. in 1. Ep. 1 Joh.*

Oecumenius refers this whole paſſage to the Jews. *If we who ſaid his Blood be on us, and on our Children, ſhould impudently ſay that we have not ſinned, we deceive our ſelves —— but if we acknowledge and confeſs this ſin, he will forgive us.* Which ſufficiently ſhews, that by confeſſing our ſins here, is meant the acknowledging our ſelves to be ſinners, in oppoſition to thoſe who plead innocency: And that this has

Oecumenius in locum.

has no relation to a particular Confeſſion of ſins to a Prieſt.

Sect. 5. But 2. When God is ſaid to be *Faithful and Juſt*, it doth not particularly reſpect that Promiſe, John 20. 23. *Whoſe Sins you remit they are remitted*; which is ſufficiently proved from this Argument that no ancient interpreter has thus applyed them; but on the contrary have referred them to other Promiſes. Thus St. *Cyprian* refers them to that Petition in the Lords Prayer, *Forgive us our Treſpaſſes*, and interprets Confeſſing in St. *John* by this Petition in the Prayer; to which he ſaith, Forgiveneſs is promiſed, St. *John* therefore ſaith, *that God who keeps his Promiſe is faithful to forgive Sins, becauſe he who hath taught us to pray for our ſins, hath promiſed, that his Fatherly Mercy and Pardon ſhall follow.* The Roman Gloſs ſaith, *God is faithful, who promiſed Grace to the humble.*

St Cyprian de orat. dom. p. 149. Oxon.

Oecumenius refers this to *Iſaiah* 43. 26. Where according to the Septuagint Tranſlation, the words are, *tell thy ſins firſt, that thou mayeſt be juſtified.* Which is uſhered in with that promiſe, *v.* 25. *I, even I am he, that blotteth out thy Tranſgreſſions for mine own ſake, and will not remember thy ſins.*

Oecum. in Loc.

Lyra ſaith, *God is faithful to forgive us our Sins, becauſe he promiſed ſo*, Mat. 3. 2. *Repent ye for the Kingdom of God is at hand.*

You ſee that the ancient Interpreters could find other Promiſes both in the Old and New Teſtament, which obliged God to forgive Sins before Auricular Confeſſion is pretended to be inſtituted; and not one of them dreamed that St. *John* had relation to that promiſe; beſide which Mr. *M.* affirms there is not another in the New Teſtament. How will he reconcile this to his profeſſion of Faith, in which he promiſes never to interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous conſent of the Fathers? When there is not one Father to vouch his ſence of this place, and ſeveral againſt him.

§ 6. But 3. Suppoſe, that conſequence followed from this place which

which he infers, that *God will not* remit Sins under the New Teſtament *without the Miniſtry of his Prieſts*: Yet it would not follow that Auricular Confeſſion is neceſſary; becauſe under the Old Law the Sins of the people were not Pardoned without the Miniſtry of Gods Prieſts, and yet it is confeſſed that Auricular Confeſſion was not then inſtituted. Beſides if the Miniſtry of the Prieſt be neceſſary, why ſhould that be underſtood rather of their private then publick Miniſtry? And laſtly, their Miniſtry may be neceſſary on other accounts then hearing Confeſſions and pronouncing Abſolutions. Thus *Oecumenius* makes the Forgiveneſs of Sins here promiſed to be that Remiſſion which is obtained in Baptiſm. *Therefore* (ſaith he) *God doth certainly remit Sins to them that come to his Holy Baptiſm.* St. *Chryſoſtome*, who wrote his Books *De Sacerdotio*, purpoſely to magnifie the Prieſts Office, interprets the promiſe in St, *John* 20. 23. by the power of admitting to Baptiſm, and the Lords Supper; together with the Prieſts Interceſſion and Prayers for Sinners; but he ſays not one word of their Remitting by an Abſolution or Judicial Sentence. Whoſoever knows St. *Chryſoſtome*, muſt own that if he had known or believed ſuch a magnificent power in the Prieſts, he wou'd never have omitted it, in Books writen deſignedly to magnifie their Office. I conclude therefore that although the Miniſtry of the Prieſts under the Goſpel is neceſſary to the Pardon of the peoples Sins: Yet that Miniſtry may conſiſt in the uſe of their Directions, Prayers, Interceſſion, and Sacraments; and I believe Mr. *M.* will hardly be able to ſhew any other way of Abſolution uſed by the ancient Church. Nay, St. *Cyprian* denies that Prieſts properly forgive Sins; becauſe all that they can do is to put men in a way to be forgiven.

Oecum. in Loc.

St. Chryſ. lib. 3. De Sacerdotio.

Non quaſi a nobis Remiſſionem peccatorum conſequantur, ſed ut per nos ad intelligentiam delictorum ſuorum convertantur, & domino plenius ſatisfacere cogantur, *Cyprian*, Ep. 75. *p.* 219. *Oxon.*

Sect. 7. The ſecond thing Mr. *M.* intends for an Argument in favour of Confeſſion, is what he alledges, *p.* 7. that Confeſſion *is approved and frequented by all the Chriſtian World, except the people*

ple of our Islands, and some few others that call themselves Reformed; and further *p.* 8. that it *was never heard of in the Catholick Church that Christians may receive the Communion of Christs Body and Blood without a previous Confession and Absolution.* Which if true, proves this Doctrine to be Catholick both as to time and place; but the best of it is, that we are not bound to take his word. And that upon Examination this will be found false in both the parts of it. For neither do all other Christians beside the Reformed frequent and approve Auricular Confession otherwise then our Church doth: Nor is it any new thing in the Catholick Church for Men to come to the Communion without private Confession and Absolution by a Priest.

The whole Greek Church *denies Auricular Confession to be of divine right, pretending it only to be a positive and Ecclesiastical constitution: And they give the Communion to Laicks both in health and sickness, though they have not before confest their Sins to a Priest; and that because they are perswaded that Confession is Arbitrary, and that Faith is the only and true preparative for receiving the Eucharist.* So Father *Simon* shews from *Caucus Venetus* in his Religion and Customs of the Eastern Nations, *p.* 8. *Lond. Ed.* 1685. and he owns that *Caucus has asserted nothing as to that point which doth not agree to the real belief of the Greeks*, p. 13.

Of the Christians of St. *Thomas* in *India*, he relates from *Menezes* that *they abominate Auricular Confession*, *p.* 94. And though he pretends this to be *an abuse introduced into that Church*, p. 102. Yet he produces nothing but his own conjecture to prove it so, and acknowledges, that *most in the East think not themselves obliged to it by Divine right:* and consequently it may either be used or laid aside as the Church thinks convenient. We learn the same from the Glos's of their own Canon Law; where we are told, *that Confession to a Priest is better said to be instituted by a certain Tradition of the universal Church, then from the Authority of the Old or New Testament. This Tradition of the Church obliges as a Command, and therefore with us* (he means the Church of *Rome*) *Confession of mortal*

Decret. de pœnit. Dist. 5. Can. 1.

tal Sins is neceſſary. But is not neceſſary with the Greeks becauſe they have no ſuch Tradition. Here is a Tradition pretended of the Univerſal Church, and yet an Acknowledgment, that at leaſt one half of that Church has no ſuch Tradition: which is as good ſence as *Roman* Catholick. However I take this to be a Demonſtration that Confeſſion is no otherways approved and frequented by the Chriſtian World; (except the Church of *Rome*) then it is by the Reformed. That is, it is looked on by all, but Mr. *M*'s Church, as a piece of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline only, and then it may be uſed or diſpenſed with, as the Church ſees moſt for her Edification.

§ 8. This is not only the Opinion of the greater part of the preſent viſible, but it was ſo likewiſe of the Ancient Church: Though Mr. *M.* tells us with confidence enough, that *it was never heard in the Catholick Church till* Henry VIII. *that any was admitted to the Communion without Confeſſion.*

Yet we find direct proof to the contrary in Antiquity: (*a*) *Socrates* tells us, that *Nectorius Biſhop of* Conſtantinople, *took away the Prieſt that was appointed for Confeſſions ſince the time of the* Decian *Perſecution, and gave free leave, that every one ſhould come to the participation of the Holy Sacrament, as his own Conſcience directed him.* (*b*) *And* Sozomen *adds, that the Biſhops of almoſt all other Churches imitated him.*

(*c*) *Gratian* propoſes the Authorities for and againſt the neceſſity of Confeſſion, *and leaves it to the Readers Judgment which he will believe.* (*d*) And the Gloſs

(*a*) Eudæmon —— Epiſcopo Nectario dedit concilium, ut Presbyterum pœnitentiarium tolleret, & liberam daret poteſtatem, uti pro ſua quiſque Conſcientia ad myſteria participanda accederet, *Soc. l.* 15. *cap.* 19. Ab illo tempore, quo Novatiani ſe ab Eccleſia ſe junxerant, recuſa verantq; cum his, qui tempore perſecutionis regnante Decio concitatæ lapſi erant, communicare, Eccleſiarum Epiſcopi Canoni adjunxerunt, ut in ſinguliis Eccleſiis Presbyter quidam pœnetentiæ præ eſſet, *Soc. ib.*

(*b*) Hoc tempore Presbyterum, qui pœnitentibus deputatus eſſet, eſſe non amplius paſſus eſt, omnium primus Nectarius: quem omnes fere Eccleſiarum præſules imitati ſunt, *Sozon, lib* 7. *cap.* 16.

(*c*) De pœnit. Diſt. 1 Can 89. Cui autem horum potius inhærendum ſit, lectoris judicio reſervatur.

(*d*) Igitur 1150. tempore Gratiani nondum ſuper hoc quicquam definitum aut præceptum erat ab Eccleſia, quia Gratianus non ignoreſſet nec omiſiſſet, ſed ferè poſt alios 100 Annos introducta fuit oris

Confeſſio per *Innocent*, III. Gloſſa Margin ubi ſupra.

on this is very remarkable. *In the year* 1150 *in the time of* Gratian, *nothing was defined or commanded concerning the neceſſity of Confeſſion by the Church: For if there had*, Gratian *had not been ignorant of it nor omitted it, but Confeſſion with the Mouth was introduced near an hundred years after by* Innocent III. Thus the *Roman* Gloſs, and the Reader muſt judge, whether he will believe Mr. *M.* who affirms, that Auricular Confeſſion was always neceſſary, or the Canon Law and Gloſs, that ſays, it was made neceſſary about the year 1215: That is not full three hundred years before *Henry* VIII. ſo late is this Sacrament even in the *Roman* Church, and the Doctrine of its neceſſity.

§ 9. The third Argument Mr. *M.* produces for Confeſſion, is grounded on the inconveniencies that ariſe from the want thereof: He tells us, *that Proteſtant Sermons have ſome Authority upon the people, but not much for lack of this curb on their vices, p.* 6. Now whether Sermons or Auricular Confeſſion are the greateſt curb to Vice, can only be judged by Experience; and let that determine whether Proteſtants or Papiſts are moſt Licentious: Let us compare Proteſtant Countries with Popiſh, and ſee where Vice doth moſt abound. Let us look into *Germany*, *Denmark*, *Switzerland*, the *Low Countries*, *England* and *Scotland*, and compare them with *Italy*, *France*, and *Spain*; and let any one judge which are moſt corrupt in their Morals, or moſt happy in their Government. Amongſt our ſelves, Let us compare the Proteſtants who have lived in proſperity theſe laſt thirty years, and conſequently have been moſt lyable to corruption, with the Papiſts that have been in adverſity, and conſequently are at the beſt: and from all theſe, we ſhall diſcern what a mighty curb Confeſſion is on the vices of Men. Laſtly, Compare the times before the Reformation, with what has been ſince, and we ſhall find even *Rome* it ſelf at this day reformed to what it was: which ſhews that the Light of Truth, which we propoſe to our people is not ſo weak a curb on Men's Vices, as Mr. *M.* would perſwade us.

The ſecond inconveniency he alledges from the want of Con-

ſeſſion

ſeſſion is the encouragement it muſt needs give people to ſin, when they conſider they are not obliged to give an account for their Sins. So (*p.* 6.) *Catholiques commit ſin, 'tis true; but call themſelves to an account for it by Confeſſion and Submiſſion to their ghoſtly Fathers. Proteſtants ſin likewiſe without calling themſelves to any ſuch reckoning; becauſe they can make a ſhift without it.* And again (*pag.* 7.) *I pray the Reader to conſider whether private Sinners in the Church of* England *do not offend God at a cheaper rate than in the Church of* Rome; *ſince in the Church of* Rome *they are bound to ſome Penance; but in the Church of* England *they may confeſs to their Miniſters and do penance if they will, or if they will not, they may let it alone.*

To which I anſwer, That the Church of *England* hath no *Tax* of Sins, nor doth ſhe promiſe Pardon of Sins upon the performance of any external action whatſoever, whether it coſt the performer dear or cheap. But ſhe tells her people, according to the Scriptures, that there is no other way to be forgiven our ſins, but by heartily turning from them; that a good Life, and ſincere Obedience to the Commandments of God through Faith in Chriſt are the only means to eſcape Damnation. And that according as every one is certain of the ſincerity of his own heart, he may be certain of Heaven, and no otherwiſe.

Let us then compare the Doctrine of the two Churches together, and let the Reader judge, who teaches the eaſieſt method for Pardon of Sins. Saith the Church of *Rome*; *If any be ſo affected in his mind that he is ſorry for the ſins he hath committed, and deſign not to ſin for the future, although he be not touched with ſuch a ſorrow, as may be ſufficient to obtain Pardon: nevertheleſs when he confeſſes duly to a Prieſt, he doth by the Power of the Keys obtain Remiſſion and Forgiveneſs for all his Villanies.*

Si quis ita animo affectus ſit ut peccata admiſſa doleat, ſimulq; in poſterum non peccare conſtituat: etſi ejuſmodi dolore non afficiatur, qui ad impetrandam veniam ſatis eſſe poſſit: ei tamen, cum peccata Sacerdoti ritè confeſſus fuerit, vi Clavium ſcelera omnia remitti, & condonari. *Catech. ad Par. par.* 2. *&c. Pœnit. Sect.* 47.

Saith the Church of *England*; *Repent you truly for your ſins paſt, have a lively Faith in Chriſt our Saviour; amend your Lives, and be in perfect charity with all men; ſo ſhall ye be meet partakers of theſe holy Myſteries.* The Churchof *Rome* ſees the difference of theſe two, and pretends, that Confeſſion was appointed by the Mercy of God to make Pardon the more eaſie. For, *Let us grant it*, ſaith ſhe, *that Sins could be blotted out by Contrition.* ——— *Yet in as much as few could come to this degree, it muſt happen that very few could expect Pardon of Sins this way.* The true Intention of Confeſſion, and of all other parts of Chriſtian Diſcipline is Amendment of the peoples Lives. And it will be found that men do not come to Confeſſion ſo much to help them to live well for the future, as to eaſe themſelves from the Trouble that the memory of their Sins paſt create them, and when by Abſolution they are eaſed of the ſenſe of their former Guilt, they are apt to think they may begin on a new ſcore. And hence it often happens that men are more negligent after Confeſſion than before. And let never ſo much care be taken to prevent this abuſe which Mr. *Arnauld* confeſſes almoſt univerſal: while people believe that the Prieſt can forgive them their ſins, as ſoon as they are ſorry for them and purpoſe to forſake them, it is impoſſible it ſhould be removed. Whereas when a man is referred to his own Conſcience, as the final Judge of his own condition; and told that he damns himſelf if he be partial. And that no other Sorrow or Repentance for ſin can ſave him, but ſuch as will in earneſt prevail with him to forſake his ſins and live a good life. In this caſe a man will find it much eaſier to ſatisfie the Prieſt, and obtain Abſolution from him; than to ſatisfie his own Conſcience. Nay after all the Prieſt can only judge of a mans Repentance from his own mouth, and if the man be partial, or miſtaken in his own ſincerity, the Prieſt muſt be ſo too, and his Abſolution

Ut enim hoc concedamus, contritione peccata deleri; ——— quoniam pauci admodum ad hunc gradum pervenirent, fiebat ut à pauciſſimis hac via peccatorum venia ſperanda eſſet. *Ubi ſupra Sect.* 46.

De la Freq. Communion, *part.* 2. *ch.* 40. *item part.* 3. *chap.* 16.

insignificant. And therefore our Church who lays the efficacy of Absolution on the sincerity of the Penitents Contrition and Faith, and tells her People that her Absolution is only conditional, deals more severely with her Penitents then the *Roman* Church who lays the chief stress on the outward Absolution of the Priest. The matter of Fact appears to be really thus, from the practice of the leudest Livers amongst us, who often take Sanctuary in that Church, and without any amendment of Life live in hopes of that Salvation in her; which they know they could not hope for in ours.

§ 11. The last Argument Mr. *M.* urges for Confession is the Interest of the Priests; saith he, *The Church of England* for want of Confession *appears to me to have lost that Interest in the Consciences of the people, which both the* Roman *and* Greek *Priests are happy in at this day.* I do believe in my Conscience this Argument goes a great way with Mr. *M.* and not only with him but with all those Priests who value their interest as he does. But he would have done well to have told us, what that interest is, in which the Priests count themselves happy. For the Priests have counted themselves happy sometimes in an interest, which contributed very little to the happyness of the people. In short, we neither do nor ought to covet any other interest with our people then the power of doing and making them good; and God be thanked, we have as much of that interest, as any Clergy of the World; and dares compare the Lives of our People with the Lives of either *Greeks*, or *Romans*. It was therefore some other interest which brought in Auricular Confession, and in which Mr *M.* would count himself happy. I shall not determine what that may be, which Mr. *M.* could not find in our Church; only he must know, that amongst us truly mortified, diligent, sober, prudent Clergy men; who continually reside on their Cures, and shew themselves an Example to their Flocks in meekness, humility, watchfulness, and charity, have no reason to complain that they want interest with their people. But there are some that think it too dear a purchase at that rate, and therefore had rather come at it another way.

way. That is, by perſwading people that they can forgive them their Sins, though perhaps they are nothing bettered by Confeſſing. Thus Mr. *M.* ſeems to ſtate the caſe: *What if ſome Catholicks are never the better for it? What are many Proteſtants the better for all the Sermons they hear, and Sacraments they receive? If we confeſs our Sins God is faithful and juſt to forgive us our Sins.* What? though we are never the *better for* Confeſſing. If that be Mr. *M*'s meaning, and he believes himſelf, he had reaſon in earneſt to change his Church: For he may be ſure we have no ſuch Catholick Doctrine.

CHAP. IV.

§ 1. MR. *M.* tells us, that *the third difficulty* that ſtuck with him *was the Anſwer given by Proteſtants to that Queſtion, where is that one Holy Catholick Church which we do profeſs to believe in the two Creeds?* To this he adds ſeveral other Queſtions: *Was there any ſuch Society as one Holy Catholick Church extant upon the face of the earth when* Cranmer *began his Reformation? What Provinces of the Earth did this Church inhabit? Did* Cranmer *believe himſelf a Member of it? Who gave him Authority to Reform this one Catholick and Apoſtolick Church? To ſet up Altar againſt Altar,* &c. *p* 8.

To each of theſe Queſtions I will give a diſtinct Anſwer, and ſhew how little Reaſon any one has to make a difficulty of them.

To the firſt, *Where is that one Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church which we profeſs to believe in the two Creeds?* I Anſwer not in any one Place or Province excluſively to the reſt; but in all places where Men profeſſing the Faith of Chriſt, live under their Lawful Paſtors or Spiritual Governors. 'Tis by theſe two marks we muſt find the Catholick Church, if we would not miſtake the Societies of Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, nay of Heathens for her. Wherever we find the Faith of Chriſt, and the perſons profeſſing

it

in living in ſubmiſſion to their Regular Paſtors; there we have found a branch of the Catholick Church; and to that Society we ought to be ready to unite our ſelves in this Profeſſion and Submiſſion.

But Mr. *M.* by his eagerneſs to have us aſſign the *ubi, or place where to find this Church*, ſeems to imagine that there is ſome one *place*, or *ubi*, where ſhe is always to be found. At leaſt that there is ſome where a Head and Principle of unity, by union to which the Society is made one. But we deny any other Head or principle of unity to this Society beſides Chriſt Jeſus. And we believe that to aſſign any ſuch on Earth is to deſtroy the very notion of the Catholick Church, and make her as particular as the Jewiſh Synagogue, out of which no Perſon or Nation was excluded ſo they would turn Proſelites, any more then they are excluded out of the Church of *Rome*, if they will embrace her Faith and ſubmit to her Government. But the Church is called Catholick in oppoſition to ſuch a particular Society; becauſe ſhe conſiſts of many ſuch Societies, which have in every Nation the ſame Priviledges, which were before peculiar to the Jews. And theſe particular Churches are intire Bodies in themſelves not made accountable by Chriſt or his Apoſtles to any Foreign Church, as to a Head but only as to a Siſter. Neither is the union of theſe particular Churches into one Catholick Church an union of ſubjection to one viſible head, but an union of Faith and Charity under our inviſible head Chriſt. When therefore Mr. *M.* asks in *what Provinces of the Earth this Church doth inhabit*; I Anſwer in moſt Provinces of the World, in more by many then he or his Church will allow. Let him read St. *Auguſtine* on the 85 *Pſalm*; and he will tell him the ſin of thoſe that confine the Church to a Province, or corner of the World, to a Sect or Party of Chriſtians.

Sect. 2. To his ſecond Queſtion, *Was there any ſuch ſociety upon the face of the earth, when* Cranmer *began his Reformation?* I anſwer, there was, and the ſeveral branches of it were diſperſed through many Provinces in *Europe*, *Aſia* and *Africa*. The Church

of

of *England* was one branch thereof, ſuch ſhe has continued ever ſince, and we hope will continue to the end of the World: and therefore he might have ſpared the labour which he has ſpent to prove that there *was extant ſuch a Church on the face of the earth*; ſince we believe as firmly as he can deſire, that according to our Saviours Prediction, *the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt the* Catholick *Church.*

Sect. 3. To his third Queſtion, *Did* Cranmer *believe himſelf a member of this Church?* I anſwer he did. And being placed by Providence in an eminent ſtation in the Church, and the Care and Government of ſo conſiderable a part thereof being committed to his charge, he found himſelf obliged by the Laws of God and man to remove thoſe things he apprehended to be Corruptions and Abuſes. And if they were really ſuch, who but Mr. *M.* can doubt his Authority to do it in a regular way?

And therefore to his fourth Queſtion, *Who gave him Authority to reform this one Holy Catholick Church, and to ſet up Altar againſt Altar?* I anſwer, No body; he never attempted the one or the other. He never attempted to reform the Catholick Church, becauſe he had neither Power or Inſpection over her. Nor did he ever pretend to make any Law to oblige her. He only endeavoured to cultivate and reform that part of her that was committed to his Care. And he muſt have loſt his Underſtanding or renounced it, that doth not ſee that this is the Duty of every Biſhop, nay of every Pariſh-Prieſt in his ſphere; and therefore except Mr. *M.* can ſhew that *Cranmer* went beyond his ſphere, he talks and asks queſtions to no purpoſe.

I ſuppoſe that I have already ſhewn that *Cranmer* did not exceed his Authority in his proceedings at the Reformation. And as he did not pretend to reform the Catholick Church, ſo neither did he ſet up Altar againſt Altar. There was no Schiſm made by him in *England*; the Diviſion of Communion was made long after, about the tenth of Queen *Elizabeth*, on the Bull of *Pius* V. *Heylin ad Ann.* 1564. & 1565. *p.* 172.

§ 4. Mr. *M.* ſeems to have nothing to object againſt all this; only

only he inſinuates that the Reformation ſuppoſes the Catholick Church *to be lapſed into Idolatry: and if ſhe were guilty of Idolatry, ſhe could be no Chriſtian Church: and then there is an end of the Epiſcopal Succeſſion of the Church of* England, *and conſequently of the Church it ſelf.*

There is not one ſtep in this Argument but is juſtly liable to exception. I ſhall only deſire the Reader to conſider theſe few things; and then judge, whether Mr. *M.* can be ſuppoſed to have examined this matter, either diligently or impartially. 1. The Reformation may be juſtified without charging the Church of *Rome* or any other Chriſtian Church with Idolatry. 2. The Idolatry with which we commonly charge that Church is not inconſiſtent with the Being of a Church, or Succeſſion of Biſhops. 3. The Argument Mr. *M.* has produced, to prove the Impoſſibility of a Chriſtian Church's teaching and practiſing *Idolatry*, is weak and inconcluſive.

Sect. 5. Firſt, The Reformation may be juſtified without charging the Church of *Rome* or any other Chriſtian Church with Idolatry: Becauſe there were many confeſſed and notorious Abuſes in the Church that needed Reformation, beſides what we count Idolatrous. And the Governours of the Church were obliged to reform them whether they were Idolatrous or no; except Mr. *M.* thinks that nothing but Idolatry can need Reformation. Prayer in an unknown Tongue, the half Communion, the ludicrous and antique Ceremonies of the Maſs, private Maſſes and Indulgences, Appeals and Foreign Juriſdiction, with many other things were removed by the Reformers; not becauſe they counted them Idolatrous, but becauſe they were great Abuſes and Deviations from the primitive Rules and Practice of the Church. The things in the *Roman* Church which we commonly charge with Idolatry, are the Worſhip of Images, the Invocation of Saints, and Adoration of the Hoſt: Now the Reformation would neither be unjuſtifiable nor unneceſſary, thô we ſhould reckon theſe practiſes only in the ſame rank of abuſes with the former. We need not therefore charge the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, to juſtifie our firſt Reformers.

But whatever be ſaid as to that, he may aſſure himſelf we never did nor will charge the Catholick Church with any ſuch Crime. She never decreed either Worſhip of Images, or Adoration of the Hoſt.

§ 6. But ſecondly, the Idolatry with which we charge the Church of *Rome* is not inconſiſtent with the being of a Church, or Succeſſion of Biſhops. I do confeſs there is an Idolatry, inconſiſtent with all true Religion; that is, when Men renounce the true God, and worſhip a falſe one in his ſtead. But there is another Idolatry, that conſiſteth in worſhipping a falſe God with, or in Subordination to the true. And a third, which Men incur by giving ſome part of that honour to a Creature, which God has reſerved for himſelf; or asking thoſe things of Creatures, which God only can give: and 'tis with this laſt the Church of *Rome* ſtands charged.

*Juſt. Vindic. p. 171: Now not only Doctor *Stillingfleet* but *Primate *Bramhall* alſo, (whom he pretends to have ſeen) have proved that ſome practice of this kind of Idolatry, as well as of ſome other Sins, may conſiſt with the Being of a Church. But what ſhall we ſay to a Man who underſtands but little himſelf, and will not be perſwaded to read thoſe who can inform him. Who takes this opinion *by hear ſay* as if it were peculiar to one Author; whereas it is the common ſence of our Controvertiſts. Which I think is a Demonſtration, that notwithſtanding what he pretends (*p.* 1.) he is yet to *begin to ſtudy the Controverſie between both Churches.* He confeſſes he did *not underſtand this* matter; and then let the World judge, whether it was done like a Man who either loved, or deſigned truth, to write againſt a thing before he underſtood it.

§ 7. In order to help his underſtanding; he would do well to conſider, 1. whether to teach and practice Idolatry deſtroy the very Being of a Chriſtian, more then of a Jewiſh Church. Now it is plain that the Jewiſh Church both taught and practiſed Idolatry, and is charged as Idolatrous; firſt, when *Aaron* with the whole Congregation Sacrificed to the Calf: and afterwards, when the Kings of *Judah* eſtabliſhed Idolatry in the very Temple of God: In which

Idola-

Idolatry the Prieſts, Prophets, Princes and People concurred; as we may ſee *Jer.* 2. 26. and yet neither their Succeſſion nor Church fail'd.

Sect. 8. 2. The Primitive Church did not look on all Idolatry as deſtructive of the Being and Succeſſion of a Church: Becauſe ſhe allowed the Succeſsion of thoſe ſhe counted Idolaters. Such ſhe reekoned the *Arians* as we may learn from *Athanaſius* and *Gregory Nyſſen*; and yet the Succeſsion of the *Arians* was allowed in (*a*) *Felix* Biſhop of *Rome*. In (*b*) *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch*. And laſtly, in the Biſhops of *Spain*, who had been *Arians* from their firſt Converſion till the time of their King *Ricaredus*, in whoſe Reign they turned Catholicks, and proceeded in that Reformation at the ſame rate our Reformers proceeded in Ours. (*c*) If Mr. *M.* had lived among them, he would have told them that they were no Biſhops. nor had any Church.: Becauſe their Predeceſſors for ſeveral Generations had taught and practiſed Idolatry. And if we believe him, *ſurely that deſtroys the very Being of a Chriſtian Church.* But neither theſe Biſhops, nor the Church of that Age were of his mind. And therefore they went on in their buſineſs, and ſettled their Church without troubling any body to aſſiſt them. And though they had no other Ordination or Sacraments, than what they had received from *Arians*, (that is from much worſe Idolaters then the *Papiſts* are counted) yet no body ever queſtioned their Church or Succeſſion. But Mr. *M.* and his party love to cut ſhort God's Church and Inheritance, and ſeem afraid too many ſhould go to Heaven. And therefore when any thing in a Church doth not pleaſe them, they immediately un-Church her, and ſend her Members to Hell: Imitating exactly in this, as they do in their Re Ordination, the Heretical Donatiſts. Whom (*d*) St. *Auguſtine* ſharply reproves for their Uncharitableneſs.

(*a*) Soc lib 2. cap. 37. Col Allogr. 1612.
(*b*) Sozom. lib. 4. cap. 27.
(*c*) Spond. ad Anno 595.
In *Pſal* 85. Chriſto tales maledicunt, qui dicunt; quod periit Eccleſia de toto orbe terrarum, & remanſit in ſola *Africa*. Si diceres illi, perdes villam tuam, forte non a te temperaret manum; & dicis Chriſtum perdidiſſe hæreditatem ſuam redemptam ſanguine ſuo.——— Ergo injuriam facis Chriſto, ut dicas populum ejus ad iſtam exiguitatem diminutum. Ideo natus es, ideo Chriſtianum te dicis, ut invideas gloriæ Chriſti.

Sect. 9. But 3. Mr. *M.* is the more inexcuſable; becauſe the Argument he brings, to prove the Inconſiſtency of Idolatry and a Chriſtian Church, is ſo very trifling and inconcluſive. *For* (ſaith he) *what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols, and what concord hath Chriſt with* Belial? *for ye are the Temple of the living God; what Communion hath Light with Darkneſs?* 2 Cor. 6. 16. *What! Idolaters, and yet a true Church? 'Tis as much as to ſay, they are in the way to Heaven and Hell at the ſame time.* In anſwer to this, I muſt deſire the Reader to look into the place of Scripture here quoted, and obſerve that the Sentences are broken, and mangled, and tranſpoſed; either out of Deſign, or, as I am apt to think, out of meer thoughtleſneſs. If he had given it whole, the Reader would eaſily have perceived its weakneſs; for it is not only ſaid, *What agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols?* v. 16. but likewiſe *What Fellowſhip hath Righteouſneſs with Unrighteouſneſs?* and *What Communion hath Light with Darkneſs?* v. 14. If then, according to Mr. *M.* Idolatry deſtroy the very Being of a Church, becauſe there is no agreement between the Temple of God and Idols: why ſhall not every Unrighteouſneſs or Sin deſtroy likewiſe the Being of a Church? ſince there is no fellowſhip between Righteouſneſs and Unrighteouſneſs; no communion between Light and Darkneſs. May not I argue as he doth, *What!* unrighteous *and a true Church? 'Tis as much as to ſay, they are in the way to Heaven and Hell at the ſame time.* This is the very Argument by which * *Petilian* the Donatiſt endeavoured to unchurch all other Chriſtians beſides his own Sect, and anull all other Baptiſm beſides his own parties: becauſe he pretended they communicated with wicked men; And there could be no fellowſhip between Righteouſneſs and Unrighteouſneſs, between Believers and Unbelievers. How then could an Unbeliever regenerate a Believer in Baptiſm? There is indeed no agreement between Idolatry and a true Church: no more is there between her and any other Sin. But things that have no agreement do not immediately deſtroy one another.

* Aug. *tom.* 7. *lib.* 2. contra Literas Petiliani.

another. It doth not follow therefore, that to teach & practiſe any Sin deſtroys the very Being of a true Church. Rebellion is as the ſin of Witchcraft, that is, equal to one of the worſt kinds of Idolatries; ſhall therefore every Society of men, that teaches & practiſes Rebellion, ceaſe to be a Church? I hope Mr. *M.* will not ſay it. I do not ſay any Society of men ever taught Treaſon, or Rebellion, or Idolatry to be lawful: for this would indeed unchurch them: But many have commanded ſuch practices & taught them to be lawful, which being put in execution, were really treaſonable, rebellious or idolatrous. Thus the Council of *Lateran* commanded temporal Lords who did not purge their Dominions of Hereticks to be depoſed by the Pope; and abſolved their Subjects from their Allegiance. And thus the Council of *Lyons* depoſed *Frederick* the Emperor. The one of theſe taught, and the other practiſed Rebellion. Muſt we therefore unchurch theſe Councils? * Pope *Paul* III. and his Faction taught and commanded the Subjects of *Henry* VIII. to depoſe their Prince. † *Pius* V. taught and commanded the Subjects of Queen *Elizabeth* to do the like to her. Theſe were all acts of Treaſon or Uſurpation: and ſure *theſe are the way to Hell* as well as Idolatry. And then to ſay, thoſe that were guilty of ſuch things were members of the Catholick Church, is according to Mr. *M. to ſay they were in the way to Hell and Heaven at the ſame time; but ſuch* Arguments *muſt be taken* from him *where there are no better.*

Vid. Concil Later. 4. cap. 3.

* Vid. Bullam apud Burnet. Coll. p. 166. ex Bullario Cherub, *tom.* 2. *p.* 704.

† Apud Sanderum de Viſibilis Mon. *p.* 710.

CHAP. V.

§ 1. THe third part of Mr. *M*'s Pamphlet conſiſts of a confuſed maſs of particulars, without any order or connexion; one would think, it had been taken from the mouth of one who had ſpoken it *ex tempore*, and had never been allowed the liberty to reviſe it. There are at leaſt five offers at a concluſion. Saith he, *p.* 9.

p. 9. *to conclude*, p. 10. *in a word*, p. 11. *in fine*, next paragraph *on the whole matter*, p. 12. after all his concluding he *muſt have a word or two before he make an end*, p. 13. he promiſes *to ſay no more*, and yet he cannot forbear adding two or three things nothing to the purpoſe. Thus he ſays and unſays, and labours in a heap of confuſion. And when all is done he puts things in a leſs advantageous Light, than has been done by many of his Brethren before him. I ſhall bring what he ſays, ſuch as it is, into this method. 1. I will conſider what he ſays in order to vindicate, or recommend his new Church. And 2. Wherein he criminates ours.

§ 2. He endeavours to vindicate his new Church in her Devotions: as to the Direction of them: as to their being in an unknown Tongue: and as to their being made before Images. He endeavours to recommend her, from the excellency of her Prayers, and from the Devotion and unity of her people.

As to the direction of her Prayers; he tells us, that *inſtead of Idolatry, he found moſt elevated and judicious Prayers to the Holy Trinity; concluding in the name of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, p. 9. and he asks, *do Roman Catholicks ever ſay Maſs to any other object but the living Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt?* p. 12. Now if all the Prayers in the Maſs be ſo very *elevated* and *judicious*, and all ſaid to the *Trinity* only: then God forgive *the wickedneſs of thoſe people who quarrel at this, and perſecute it with ſo blind and furious Averſion.* But ſoft and fair, Mr. *M.* conſider they are Hereticks you pray for, and ten to one either do not deſerve, or do not need your Charity. For ſuppoſe the Prayers in the Maſs were never ſo judicious, and never ſo well directed; yet for ought the people know, or any aſſurance they have beſides the honeſty of the Prieſt, the Prayers may be Conjuring, or Curſing; directed to *Jupiter*, or *Mahomet*; and therefore it is your own Fault that people perſecute them with ſo blind and furious Averſion; ſince you keep the people in that blindneſs, and will not let them underſtand their Prayers; that they may admire their Judiciouſneſs.

§ 3. But 2. It is to be conſidered, that the Maſs was patched

up

up in a barbarous and ignorant Age, though many of the Materials are old; and the compoſition is ſuch, that all, even of the *Roman* Communion, are not ſatisfyed concerning the Judiciouſneſs of the Prayers in it. In ſo much that (*a*) *Caſſander*, who was a little better acquainted with it, then Mr. *M.* confeſſes the phraſe is obſcure, even to Learned Men: that the Canon is difficult, and that ſometimes there is a ſudden jump from one ſence of a word to another.

Caſſander was no *perverſe ill natured Phanatick*, but a learned and ingenuous *Roman* Catholick: and yet he finds fault with this Prayer Mr. *M.* has produced, and others of the like importance in the Maſs; becauſe they are improperly uſed, as Maſſes are now celebrated: for theſe Prayers have reſpect (as he tells us) to an ancient cuſtom in the Church now gone out of uſe; and agree chiefly to a Solemn Maſs, in which there is ſuppoſed to be a Communion and Congregation of the people that have offered Bread and Wine. This Bread and Wine offered by the people is that *immaculate Sacrifice* offered up by the Prieſt in the Prayer mentioned by Mr. *M.* And where neither People are preſent, nor any Offering is made by them, this Prayer and ſeveral others in the Maſs make a hard ſhift to gain the Eſtimation of either Senſe or Truth, much leſs of Judiciouſneſs. And has given occaſion to ſome, to abuſe the Maſs to Superſtition; and to others, to condemn it as Impious. How can a Prieſt, with either Judgment or Truth, offer a Sacrifice for all preſent, as the Prayers direct him to do; even in a ſolitary Maſs, when none is preſent or near him?

(*a*) Ipſa etiam loquendi forma Canonem ipſum non indoctis hominibus obſcuriorem, & difficiliorem reddat. ---- Eſt autem hujus obſcuritatis præcipua cauſa, quod in eo multipliciter Sacrificij nomen uſurpetur; & ſubito non nunquam ex uno intellectu in alium tranſitio fiat. *Conſul. de interatione, p.* 1004.

(*b*) Ut ſi orationibus his ſua veritas conſtet, intelligi debent ea ſymbola panis, & vini, quæ in dominica menſa ad Conſecrationem propoſita ſunt, nomine populi eſſe oblata. ——— Deinde dubium non eſt, quo tempore Canon hic initio uſurpabatur, aliquos ſemper ad fuiſſe, qui una cum ipſo ſacerdote, hæc Sacrificia laudis efferebant, & Sacramenta participabant, id enim Canonis verba manifeſtè ſignificant. ——— Cujus ignoratio alijs ad ſuperſtitionem eo abutendi aliis ut impium ipſum damnandi occaſionem dedit. Ubi ſupra, *p.* 1003.

But

But 3. As all the Prayers in the Mass are not judiciously contrived, so neither are they all said to the Trinity; the very Sacrifice being offered up for the Honour of Saints and Angels, and to obtain of them their Intercession: besides several Prayers made to them for the same purpose, directly contrary to what we learn from Saint *Augustine* to have been the Practice of the ancient Church.

Ut illis proficiat ad honorem, nobis autem ad salutem: & illi pro nobis intercedere dignentur, &c. Ordo Missæ.

Suo loco & ordine nominantur, non tamen à Sacerdote qui sacrificat invocantur. De Civit Dei, lib. 22. cap. 10.

§ 4. Mr. *M.* seems aware of this Objection, and hints at three Answers to it. 1. That Presbyterians object as much against that Canticle in the Common Prayer Book called *Benedicite*. 2. That the Roman Catholicks ascribe nothing to Angels or Saints, but as the Ministers of God. And 3. that the Angels must know our affairs, and the Saints have intelligence from them; and therefore we may pray to them.

1. He assures us that the Reader *shall find Protestants objecting nothing against Confessing, and Praying to Saints and Angels; but what Presbyterians do against that Canticle in the Common Prayer Book, called* Benedicite omnia opera. *O* Ananias, Azarias *and* Misael, *praise ye the Lord, is as rank Popery with Presbyterians, as any thing in the Mass, or Litanies of our Lady.* p. 9. Now except he be able to shew where the Presbyterians have declared this as their sense, we can count him no better than a Slanderer. For my part I do profess, that I never yet met with one single Presbyterian so silly as to mistake this Apostrophe for an Invocation *of dead men, who do not hear us.* The disparity of the case is so manifest between our Church and the *Roman*, that it is hardly possible any should mistake. * The *Roman* Church has determined that it is *good and profitable humbly to invocate the Saints*, and to *flee to their Prayers for help and assistance.* (a) Our Church has declared *Invocation of Saints to be a fond thing, vainly invented.* To parallel therefore the Presbyterian Objection (if

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de Invocatione, &c.

(a) Article 22.

(if any ſuch there be) againſt us; with ours againſt the Papiſts on this Head, is to ſhift off an Objection, which did not eaſily admit of an Anſwer.

§ 5. Let us ſee if his ſecond Anſwer be any better; which is, that the *Roman* Catholicks attribute nothing *to Angels or Saints, but as the Miniſters and Favourites of the living God, receiving from him whatever underſtanding they have of our affairs* p. 12. But what then? May not men aſcribe more to Favourites than the King allows them, and is not that an encroachment on his Prerogative? If Mr. *M.* will ſhew us, where God allows us to make Prayers to Saints, to erect Images for their Worſhip, burn Incenſe before them, dedicate Churches to their Honour, make Vows to them, or devote Orders and Societies of men as ſlaves to their ſervice, he will indeed vindicate his Church againſt the Reformation: for in poſſeſſion of all theſe, the firſt Reformers found them, and juſtly concluded it ſafeſt to lay them aſide, as too much to be allowed Favourites out of our own head, without the expreſs Declaration of the Princes Will. But if he cannot ſhew that God allows them theſe things, it will be the ſafeſt way, and no hurt for him or us, to let them alone.

§ 6. His third Anſwer or pretence is no leſs inſufficient: where he alledges, that *the Angels muſt know our affairs, becauſe they are miniſtring Spirits ſent forth for the good of thoſe who ſhall be heirs of Salvation; and becauſe they rejoice at the Converſion of Sinners: and have glorified Saints no Communication or Intelligence with the Angels?* p. 13. To which I anſwer, That theſe allegations neither juſtifie the Invocation, nor the Worſhip of Angels or Saints. It is true, the Angels are miniſtring Spirits; but we neither know which of them are aſſigned to miniſter to us, nor when they are preſent. Theſe things depend altogether on the immediate Will of God; and therefore it is to Him not Them we are to apply our ſelves, if we would obtain their Care and Miniſtry for our good. 'Tis true likewiſe, that *the Saints and Angels rejoice at our Converſion* when that Converſion comes to their knowledge. But that place in St. *Luke* 15. 7. *I ſay unto you, Joy ſhall be in Heaven over one ſinner*

ner that repents, more than over ninety nine juſt perſons, doth no more prove that the Angels in Heaven know all the Converſions on Earth, or that we ought to pray to them; than my ſaying, that there is more Joy in *Rome* over one ſuch Proſelite as Mr. *M.* than over ninety nine born *Roman* Catholicks, doth prove that I believe ſuch Converſions are all known there; and that therefore Mr. *M.* may go into his Cloſet, and pray to the Cardinals, becauſe it is plain his affairs are known at *Rome*. Laſtly, 'Tis true, that the glorified Saints have Communication with the Angels, and may receive intelligence of our affairs from them; and therefore I would adviſe Mr. *M.* to ſend his Service and Requeſts to them by the next Angel he meets going that way. But becauſe Angels paſs and repaſs from Heaven to Earth, to conclude that we may at all times and in all places with mind and voice pray to Saints, is as fooliſh, as to conclude, becauſe we have Poſts paſs from *London* to *Dublin*, that therefore a man here may beg the aſſiſtance of his Friends Prayers who are in *London* every time he goes to his knees. This is the wiſe Vindication Mr. *M.* has made for his Church as to the Direction of ſome of her Prayers.

§ 7. The ſecond thing, which Mr. *M.* undertakes to vindicate in his Church, is her uſing a Tongue unknown to the people in all her publick Devotions, and Services. And it happens to him in this as it does in moſt other things; if all that he ſays were granted him, it would neither juſtifie his Church, nor condemn the Reformation; ſince not one of his Arguments ſo much as pretend to prove a known Tongue unlawful in the publick Service of God, or an unknown Tongue expedient: which will appear on the examination. He alledges therefore, 1. *That the Objection of its being ſaid in the* Latine *tongue, allows every one to hear it that underſtands* Latine. A great favour indeed. Who can after this accuſe the *Roman* Church of keeping men ignorant of her Service? It is plain from our very Objection that they may hear it, if they but underſtand *Latine:* and 'tis their own fault if they do not underſtand it: 'Tis only ſpending ſeven or eight years to acquire the *Latine* Tongue, and then they may underſtand ſome

part

part of her Service. But pray what is this to the illiterate world, who are paſt the age of learning *Latine?* what is this to the poor, who are the bulk of the world, and have the beſt and moſt peculiar Titlo to the Goſpel; and yet have neither capacity nor opportunity to learn *Latine?* Mr. *M.* bids them be of good chear: *for unlearned Catholicks, if the truth were known, underſtand as much or more of the Maſs, than illiterate Proteſtants do of the Common Prayer.* If a man were apt to give ill words, the confidence and palpable falſhood of this Aſſertion would certainly provoke him. It were better ſurely to believe *nothing but our Senſes,* which he falſly imputes to ſome Proteſtants, than to undertake to face down Senſe and Experience, in a matter in which the meaneſt, moſt illiterate Proteſtant in the world will be a Demonſtration againſt him. We are content our people ſhould believe all Mr. *M.* ſays, according as they find this true. But he objects further, *What does the Proteſtant Multitude underſtand of the Predictions of* Iſaiah, &c. *read in their Churches by appointment of the Common Prayer?* Suppoſe they underſtood not one word of them: how doth it follow, that unlearned Catholicks underſtand more of the Maſs, than illiterate Proteſtants do of the Common Prayer Book? This is a new inſtance of Mr. *M*'s old Infirmity in drawing Conſequences. We are now talking of Common Prayers, in which the people ought to join: and he talks of the Leſſons, which are no part of them. There are commonly in every Congregation perſons of better and of meaner capacity; 'tis fit both ſhould be inſtructed. Thoſe Leſſons out of *Iſaiah* are for the better capacities, and are read ſo as may make them moſt eaſie to them. And what great matter, if the weaker, for whom they are not intended, do not underſtand them, ſince they are ſufficiently provided for otherwiſe. Their obſcurity might be ſome reaſon againſt reading them at all: but if they ought to be read; as is ordered both by the Common Prayer Book and Breviary, I hope they will be better underſtood in *Engliſh* than *Latine*: and yet after all there is not one Leſſon ordered to be read by the Common Prayer Book, but the meaneſt of the Proteſtant Multitude underſtands more of

it, then a whole illiterate Popiſh Congregation underſtands of the Breviary, or Maſs; and of this he may make an experiment when he pleaſes.

His ſecond Allegation in behalf of his Church is that ſhe has ſet forth Expoſitions of the *Maſs* in Print. *How many Expoſitions of the Maſs* (ſays he) *are extant in Print by Commandment of the Church? So that no man can be ignorant of it that deſires to be informed.* To this I Anſwer, that if by an Expoſition be meant a Tranſlation of the Maſs, there is not one extant in Print by Commandment of their Church. On the contrary, the Congregation of the Index have Damned the very hours of the bleſſed Virgin; for being in the vulgar Tongue; as may be ſeen at large in St. *Amours Journal, Part* 3. *Chap.* 9. There is indeed a Tranſlation ſtolen out of late in *Engliſh*, but it is without any Authority, which may be called a Commandment of their Church. However, if it were ſet out by her Authority, What could it ſignifie to the greater part of the people, who are neither able to procure nor read that Tranſlation? And if they could read it, yet would no more be able by help of it to join with the Prieſt, then by any other Devotional Book. Laſtly, What is this to the Reformation, which found not one Expoſition in Print by Commandment of the Church, nor any counted neceſſary? I will venture to put one queſtion to Mr. *M.* and having askt ſo many, I hope he will not take it ill. Ought the Maſs to be underſtood by the people, or no? If it ought to be underſtood, why is not the beſt method taken to make them underſtand it; even to read it in a Tongue underſtood by them? If it matters not, whether it be underſtood by the people or no; to what purpoſe doth he talk of an Expoſition?

His third Argument in behalf of the practice of his Church is taken from the example of the Jewiſh Church. *Had not* (ſaith he) *the Jewiſh Church almoſt all her Scriptures and publick Service for fourteen Generations, that is to ſay, from the Captivity unto Chriſt in the old Hebrew? a Language not then underſtood by the common people.* I Anſwer, ſhe had ſome of them in old Hebrew,

brew, but not only in it. They were read in the Synagogues, first in *Hebrew* for the use of the Learned, and then in the vulgar for the common people. This he might have learnt from Father (*a*) *Simon*, (*b*) and Bishop *Walton*: Nay (*c*) Doctor *Isaac Vossius* is positive, that the *Greek* was the vulgar Language of *Jerusalem* in our Saviours time; and that the *Septuagint* Translation, and not the old *Hebrew* was read in the Synagogues of the Jews. And all unanimously conclude, that the people either understood the original of what was read, or were made understand it by an Interpreter. 'Tis probable Saint *Paul*, had respect to this custom among the Jews, when he commands, the Prophet that spake with Tongues *to keep silence in the Church, if* there was *no Interpreter*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 28. And therefore Mr. *M.* has quite mistaken his Argument, when he asks, *Did our Saviour or his Apostles ever reprehend the Jews —— for not translating the Scripture into the vulgar Language?* There was no ground for such a Reprehension, since the Jews had done it three hundred years before; and therefore will rise up in Judgment against the absurd practice of the *Roman* Church, and will condemn her; who is more unkind to her Subjects then the very Jews, and has provided worse for their Edification in this point. It is to no purpose to say as Mr. *M.* doth, that the *Latine is more vulgar than the English*: Since this is a manifest falshood; and must be owned to be such, by all men who consider that the *Latine* is not vulgar in any place of the World.

(*a*) Critical History of the Old Testament *Lib* 2. *chap* 18 *p.* 123. *London*, 1682.
(*b*) Proleg. 12. *sect.* 7. *p.* 83.
(*c*) De sibyllinis *cap.* 16 *p.* 284 *Lond.* 1684. Et plenius ad Iterat. p. Simonis object. Resp. *p.* 376 & 377.

I cannot tell whether I can call it a fourth Argument which he offers, in these words, *If the service of God must be said in the maternal tongue of every Nation, where shall an English man in* France *or* Spain, *that understands not the language, go to serve God on the Lords day?* I answer, to Church; and join his presence, and private Devotions with the Congregation: since he cannot join in the publick Prayers. In case of necessity a man is accepted by God according to what he can do; and what is not in his power is not required

required of him. In a Country where there are no Christians, he must go no where; and in a strange Country, he must go to the publick Devotions, though he do not understand them: for that is better then not going at all.

His last Argument for the vindication of the publick Service of the Church in an unknown tongue is, *That this would destroy all community of Sacraments and Liturgie between the Members of the Catholick Church: which being one Body or Society of Men, cannot be like the Builders of* Babel, *who could not understand one anothers language.* Now if they that understand not one anothers language are Builders of *Babel*; then the Priest and People, where the Service is in an unknown Tongue, are plainly such Builders: for they do not understand one another. Two Cities may very well be built, and conveniently governed by two people of different Languages; and these Cities may likewise manage all their common business, and keep a good correspondence, by the help of a few men that understand both Languages. But two Languages in the same City is very inconvenient, and cannot be so remedied. It is so in the Church: distant Congregations may have a very good Communion with one another by the help of their Priests who understand a common Language: but to have a Language spoken to a Congregation, or in it, that the Members cannot understand, is to bring in a great confusion, and directly opposite to the Apostles command which he himself here produces. *Rom.* 15. 16. that we should *with one mind and mouth glorifie God*, for how can a Congregation glorifie God with one mouth, if they do not understand the words in which they are to join? thus Mr. *M*'s. Arguments constantly make against himself. If want of a common Language destroys unity of Sacraments and Liturgy, in distant Churches; it destroys that unity much more where there is wanting a common language between the Priest & People in the same Church. But the truth is, the unity of the Sacraments, and Liturgies have no dependance on the unity of Language; but are the same in whatever language they are used or administred. And so it was in the Primitive Church, where every

people

people had their own Liturgy in their own language. Mr. *M.* foreſaw that 1 *Cor.* 14. would be objected againſt him: And he tells us, *p.* 11. *That he humbly thinks it not well underſtood by Proteſtants.* This is a main point; and one would have expected a ſubſtantial Reaſon for his opinion, ſome Determination of a primitive Council, or a whole ſhoal of Fathers at leaſt: but inſtead of that, he pretends to cut the throat of the Objection out of that very Chapter, in which Proteſtants glory. *If any be ignorant* (ſaith he) *let him be ignorant. Wherefore Brethren, covet to Propheſie, and forbid not to ſpeak with Tongues, v.* 39. *God is not the Author of Confuſion but peace, v.* 33. I ſhall not trouble the Reader with an Anſwer to theſe Arguments; if Mr. *M.* deſigned in earneſt to prove by them that we do not well underſtand the Apoſtle in this Chapter, I would adviſe him to take the Opinion of a Phyſician, whether all be right about his head.

§ 8. The third thing wherein Mr. *M.* endeavours to vindicate his Church is the Worſhip of Images. And to this pupoſe he alledges, Firſt, *That the Council of* Trent hath commanded *all Superſtition to be taken away in the uſe of Images; and then gives it in charge to all Biſhops to look to it,* p. 12. If they had reckoned the Worſhip of Images ſuperſtition, this had indeed taken away our Objection, but on the contrary, the Council decreed that Images *of Chriſt, not of his humane nature,* (as he improperly expreſſes it) and likewiſe of the Bleſſed Virgin and other Saints are to be had and retained, eſpecially in Churches, and due Honor and Worſhip is to be paid them. And that we ought to kiſs, uncover our heads, and fall proſtrate before them.

§ 9. But then, Secondly, He bids us *enquire whether Roman Catholicks pay any more reſpect to them, than Proteſtants do to the Elements of Bread and Wine, which* (*ſay they*) *are but a Figure or Image of Chriſts Body and Blood.* To which I anſwer, That this Enquiry ſuppoſes two notorious Falſhoods; Firſt, That Proteſtants pay any other reſpects to the Elements of Bread and Wine, then that of not diverting them from their Sacramental uſe. And Secondly, That they ſay the Elements *are but a Figure or Image of*

Chriſt

Christs Body and Blood. Our Church having declared in her Rubrick after the Communion, that the kneeling at the Reception of the Sacrament is only to Christ; and that *no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine:* and likewise concerning the Elements, that they are not *only Signs* or Images, but *effectual means* of conveying *the Body and Blood of Christ to the Faithful.* Which I hope no Papist will say of his Images. And now I must refer it to the Reader, whether he will suppose Mr. *M.* to have been ignorant of our Doctrine in this point, or to have knowingly and against his Conscience suggested these falsehoods.

§ 10. His third attempt for the Defence of his Church in this practice is from his old friends the Presbyterians. *The Church of* England *Protestants are every jot as offensive to us* (say the Presbyterians) *kneeling before the Elements of Bread and Wine, as the Papists kneeling before the Images of Christ.* To which I answer, That if the matter of Fact here alledged were true, (which I do not believe) yet it were no Argument; because the Presbyterians, or whosoever are thus offended, are manifestly unreasonable in paralleling these two cases. The Disparity is apparent, and the very same that there is between receiving a Pardon, or any other signal Favour from the Kings own Hand on my knees; and falling down every time I see his Picture on a Sign-post.

But once for all, let Mr. *M.* know, (for he professes to need Information,) that it is no Answer to an Argument, to pretend that others urge it against the Proponents themselves; except the Answerer shew that both urge it with equal Reason. For so the Apostles might have been answered by a Heathen. You would perswade us, that we are under *the Power of Satan,* and *Aliens to the Life of God*; do not the Gnosticks say the same of you? Silence them, and we will believe you. So a *Roman* Catholick may be answered by an *Indian,* You would have us renounce our Idols and Heroes: whereas there is a people amongst your selves called Protestants, to whom your *kneeling before the Images of Christ* and praying to Saints, *are every jot as offensive* as our praying to

our

our ſubordinate Celeſtial Powers and kneeling before their Images. If this would ſignifie nothing to Mr. *M.* why ſhould it ſignifie any thing to us what Presbyterians object againſt our kneeling at the Reception of the Sacrament? or how are we concerned, what *they pretended in* 41. againſt our Reformation, or *Hugh Peters* in 47. againſt theirs? except he will undertake to juſtifie their pretences, which is a task themſelves could never perform.

§ 11. There is only one thing more he ſays in vindication of his Church; and that *concerns the ill Practices* we charge on *ſome* Roman Catholicks, and *the ill Opinions of others.* He doth not deny that there are ſome ſuch, but he *looks on it as no argument at all.* If ſo, he wrote his Book to very little purpoſe; for why are we more concerned in the ill Practices or ill Opinions of ſome who pretend to reform, than he is in the ill Practices & Opinions of the Pope and Court of *Rome?* Yet theſe pretended faults of the Reformers make up the greateſt part of what he objects againſt our Church: which ſhews that he has one Rule for us, and another for his own party. But the truth is, we charge the Council of *Trent* it ſelf with ſome *ill Practices and Opinions.* For thô we take *Popery* as the moſt judicious Papiſts *repreſent it*; (and they who bring the Decrees of the Council of *Trent* neareſt to Proteſtaniſm I find are at preſent counted ſuch:) yet ſtill there needs better Vouchers than Mr. *M.* to make us believe all things in it *judicious and pious.*

§ 12. Having thus examined all that he has ſaid in defence of his Church, let us next conſider what he has offered to recommend her. And of this nature he produces three inſtances; the Excellency of her Books of Devotion, the Devotion of her People, and the Unity of her Members. He tells us, *p.* 9. that, *that which obliged him moſt of all to the Church of* Rome, *was the peruſal of her Books of Devotion: ſuch as St.* Francis Sales —— Neirembergius —— Lewis Granatenſis —— *eſpecially the Maſs it ſelf.* If theſe obliged him moſt of all, had he lived at the Reformation, he had wanted ſome of the ſtrongeſt obligations to keep him in the *Roman* Communion; three of theſe four he mentions being

written after the Reformation, and the other but a few years before. And now they are written he was not debarred the use of them in the Communion in which he lived. The Spirit of the Reformation, which he says he compared without prejudice with the Spirit of the *Roman* Church, allowing the use of all Books that may advance Piety by whomsoever they are written, which the Spirit of his Church doth not: But what is this to the Reformation, which did not find, much less condemn these Books? Let him shew one Book of Devotion, or Exposition of the Mass or Breviary extant in *English* before the Reformation, if he can; and remember what has been done since, to the eternal shame of those, who never troubled themselves with Devotion, till meer necessity of supporting their interest among the people put them on it. As for the Piety of the Prayers in the Mass, let him who understands both compare any Prayer *there* with our Litany, and 'tis hardly possible prejudice should so blind him, as not to see which has the advantage.

§13. But nevertheless he alledges, that the Devotion of their people exceeds ours. *Let the Reader compare that Devotion which Catholicks pay to the Sacrifice of the Mass, with that which most Protestants shew to the Common-Prayer, and then see how much better we are by reforming the Mass into English*, p. 11. To which I Answer, that if it were granted, that Papists appear to be more devote at Mass then Protestants at Church (for that I suppose he means by paying Devotion to the Mass, and shewing it to the Common-Prayer) yet it would not follow that the Mass were better then the Common Prayer, or a fitter means of Devotion: Since that difference might arise from other motives, as it manifestly doth. The *Roman* Catholicks place much more Religion in outward shew, then the Protestants, and therefore no wonder if they be more diligent in it.

2. If the appearance of Devotion at publick Service be an Argument of the goodness of the Service, the *Turks* who out do the generality of Christians in frequency, seeming Devotion, and Reverence at their Prayers, as we are informed by Travellers, must be concluded to have the best Service: and he would do ill on

Mr. *M*'s Principles that would Reform the *Alchoran* into the Maſs.

3. The matter of Fact is not true, as I am informed by thoſe that have ſeen their Communicants and ours. Proteſtants have according to Mr. *M*'s deſire compared the Devotions of the Church of *Rome* with thoſe of the Church of *England* in a diſcourſe deſigned for that very purpoſe, and printed *London*, 1685. In which it is ſhewn, *that whatever the Romaniſts pretend, there is not ſo true Devotion among them, nor ſuch rational proviſion for it, nor Encouragement to it, as in the Church eſtabliſhed by Law among us.*

4. It is not material what their Devotions appear to be, if their Lives are not better then ours, which I am ſure they are not. Open Prophaneneſs is hardly more provoking to God, then ſhew of Devotion without proportional Sanctity of Life, as we learn from the caſe of the Jews of old, in *Iſa.* 1. *Jer.* 7. and in many other places of Scripture.

Sect. 14. The third thing whereby he endeavours to recommend his Church, is the Unity of her Members. *In the Church of* Rome *he ſhall find variety of Religious Orders, but no Schiſm, nor Diſcord about their Sacraments or Liturgy. In the Garment of the Church there is variety, but no Rent. No confuſion of Sects, nor Diſobedience to Superiors.* pag. 14. If this be true, ſhe is the happieſt Church that ever was in the World; much happier than the Church of the Apoſtles time: for there were Schiſms and Diſcords about Sacraments and Liturgy in her. Witneſs the Apoſtle, 1 *Corinth.* 1. 11. alſo 11. 18. Nay there was Diſobedience too, *Gal.* 3. 1. 3 *Joh.* 9. It is therefore ſtrange we ſhould be able to find none in the Church of *Rome*. May we not rather conclude that Mr. *M.* has either partially or negligently ſought for theſe Schiſms and Diſcords? ſince really there has hardly been greater Schiſms and Diſcords in any Church than in her, though he affirms we ſhall find none. **Bellarmine* loved the Church of *Rome* as well as Mr. *M* and he owns 26 Schiſms in her. †*Onuphrius Panvinius*, who uſes not to ſpeak ill of the *Roman* Church, reckons 30; one he calls the worſt and longeſt, which continued 50 years, others

* *See his* Chronology ad ann. 1439.

†*See his* Chronicon Pontificum ad ann. 1378.

were of 20, or 15, or 10. *&c.* These Authors only reckon those Schisms where the people were divided between two Popes: But it were easie to shew, that besides these there were in that Church great and enormous Schisms, which had no Popes to head them. And as for Discords about Sacraments, I suppose, Mr. *M.* reckons Ordination a Sacrament. And concerning it there have been many Discords; many Popes have damned their Predecessors, and annulled their Ordinations. So *Stephen* VII. nulled the Ordinations of *Formosus* his Predecessor. *John* IX. did as much for *Stephen*, and *Sergius* III. for him. * *Platina* tells us, that *after the time of* Stephen VI. or, as others reckon, the VII. *it became a custom for the succeeding Popes to infringe or quite destroy the Acts of their Predecessors.* † *Spondanus* tells us, *These are the unhappy times, wherein every intruding Pope annulled the Acts of his Predecessors.* And further, that *the Power of Whores was so great in* Rome, *that they removed true and lawful Popes, and thrust in violent and wicked men. Who, considering this, would not think God had forgotten his Church?* Behold the Mission of the *Roman* Bishops, and their Unity. And if notwithstanding these Schisms and Intrusions, which continued for many years, the Church of *Rome* continued a true Church, and her Ordinations valid; let the Reader judge what there is so horrid or irregular in our Reformation, that should void our Orders, or make us cease to be a Church.

* Cum postea fere semper servata hæc consuetudo sit, ut acta priorum Pontificum, sequentes aut infringerent, aut omnino tollerent. *Plat. de Vitis Pontif. in Joh.* 6.

† *Spond. ad ann.* 908. *Sect.* 2. Hinc q; tantum invaluit meretricum imperium, ut pro arbitrio legitimè creatos Pontifices demoverent, & violentos ac nefarios homines intruderent. Quæ considerans, quis non putarit Deum oblitum Ecclesiæ suæ? *Spond. ubi supra Sect.* 3.

§ 15. I suppose Mr. *M.* counts Confirmation another Sacrament; and there have been no less discords about it of late in the *Roman* Church. The Regulars of *England* on one side, and the Bishops of *France* with the *Sorbon* on the other. And *those of each party charge the other with Heresie, not without the disturbance of the publick Peace, and a rent of brotherly Charity.* So the Congregration of the *In-*

dex

dox tells us: which Congregation made a Decree to ſuppreſs the Writings of both parties, *May* 19. 1633. And here we do not find that *Obedience to Superiors* in this matter of which Mr. *M.* boaſts: for immediately there came out at *Paris* a Diſquiſition againſt the Decree, the Jeſuits reply, and the Biſhops of *France* renew their Condemnation & Cenſure, *Nov.* 29. 1643. and I do not find that they are yet agreed. Mr. *M.* affirms we ſhall find *no Rent, no Confuſion of Sects, no Diſobedience to Superiors* in the Church of *Rome*. But whoſoever will read the Decrees and paſſages about this matter, in St. *Amours* Collection at the end of his *Journal*, *p.* 26. or in *Petrus Aurelius*'s *Vindiciæ Cenſuræ*, will find a great rent of brotherly Charity, much Confuſion, and great Diſobedience in the diſagreeing parties; and theſe about no leſs things *than the Sacrament of Confirmation, the Hierarchy of the Church, and Supremacy of St.* Peter.

§ 16. Confeſſion is no leſs a Sacrament with Mr. *M.* and the diſputes in his Church have of late been as high about it, as about the former; one party charging the other with no leſs than Hereſie: as may be ſeen at large in the Biſhops of *Frances* Letter to *Innocent* X. at the end of Mr. *Arnaulds* Book of Frequent Communion. If their publick Acts are to be believed, there are Rents, *Sciſſuræ fraternæ Charitatis* in their Church. But if we believe Mr. *M.* there is no Rent, *Sciſſura non eſt*. I ſhall ſay nothing of the Diſpute concerning the Regale in *France* at this day, I need not put him in mind of what Obedience has been paid to the Pope, or to his Excommunications of the Archbiſhop of *Tholouſe*, and Regaliſts. He may ſee the whole in a Book intitled *Regale Sacerdotum*, 1684. I do not ſee but the King and Church of *France* make themſelves *Judge, Witneſs* and *Accuſer* in this affair with the Pope as much as *Henry* VIII. and the *Engliſh* Church did.

§ 17. This is all that Mr. *M.* ſeems to ſay either to vindicate or recommend his Church. Let us ſee next what he objects againſt ours. And in all this laſt part I can find only three things of this nature. One is *pag.* 10. that *the Church of* England *is beholding to the Maſs for the beſt Flowers in her Communion Service.*

The

The ſecond is, that *the Proteſtant Church has no other Foundation than every mans Reaſon*; and the 3d is, that we do not pay a due Submiſſion to the Church. As to the firſt of theſe, I ſuſpect the chief reaſon, why ſome of his party object the Communion Service being taken out of the Maſs, is not that they think it any fault if it were, but becauſe they believe it may gratifie and incenſe their friends the Nonconformiſts againſt the publick Service of the Church. But I anſwer, that the Model of our Service and Materials thereof are not taken out of the Maſs, but out of the ancient Liturgies of the Church, to which it is much more conformable than to the Maſs.

§ 18. The ſecond Objection he brings againſt our Church is, that ſhe has no ſufficient foundation, *p.* 11. *I deſire to be informed whether the Proteſtant Church had any other foundation (ſetting aſide an Act of Parliament) than every man's own reaſon, or which is the ſame thing, the Scriptures interpreted by every man's reaſon. There are but two Baſes whereupon to ſettle our ſelves, the Scriptures and Fathers expounded by my own reaſon, or the Scriptures and Fathers expounded by the voice of the preſent viſible Church. This later is Popiſh, and cannot ſupport a reformed Fabrick.* In anſwer to this, I will ſhew, firſt, in what ſence every man's reaſon may be ſaid to be the foundation of his Church. Secondly, That our Church has truſted her reaſon in the expounding Scriptures and Fathers no farther than ſhe ought to have done. And Thirdly, That ſhe has not expounded them ſo as to contradict the ſence of the preſent viſible Church.

Firſt therefore, When Mr. *M.* alledges that our Church has no other foundation than every man's reaſon, he may mean that ſhe has no other foundation for her Religion, than what natural Reaſon, without the aſſiſtance of Revelation, and other helps God has afforded her, doth ſuggeſt. And this is a manifeſt calumny, becauſe ſhe has, beſides what natural reaſon of it ſelf ſuggeſts, the Scriptures, the Fathers, the univerſal tradition of all ages paſt and preſent for every Article of her Faith. Let him ſhew one Article that wants any one of theſe, and we will ſtrike it out

of

of our Creeds; or any other Article that has this teſtimony for its neceſſity and it ſhall be inſerted.

There may be another ſence of theſe words, the Proteſtant Church has no other foundation than every man's Reaſon: and 'tis this, the Proteſtants make uſe of no other faculties to find out the ſence of Scriptures and Fathers, of the former and preſent Church, but their Reaſon and Senſes: and conſequently rely on them with God's aſſiſtance to find out the true Religion and Church. This ſenſe we allow, and except Mr. *M.* and his party will ſhew us ſome other faculties given us by God, whereby we may chooſe our Religion, they ought not to blame us for uſing theſe only. When they find out another faculty of the Soul beſides theſe two, whereby we may diſtinguiſh Truth from Falſhood, we promiſe them to uſe it alſo. And though Mr. *M.* confeſſes his *own reaſon to be as weak as any body can think it*, and pretends *not to aſſert it, but the Authority of the Church:* yet till he tells us by what faculties he judges himſelf obliged to ſubmit to the authority of the Church, and by what faculties he comes to know that the Roman Church is ſhe, to whoſe authority he ought to ſubmit, we muſt tell him, that the authority of his Church, as to him, is founded meerly and ſolely on his own reaſon, how weak ſoever he own it. And ſo muſt the authority of every Church to every Man in the world. And therefore it is fooliſh to object that the Proteſtant Church has no other foundation than every man's Reaſon and Sences: for no Church, no not Chriſtianity, has or can have any other.

§ 19. But ſecondly, perhaps Mr. *M.* means only that we do not allow the voice of the preſent viſible Church a due regard in our Determination concerning Faith and Religion. In Anſwer to which in the ſecond place, I ſay our Church truſted her reaſon no further in expounding Scripture than ſhe ought to have done. And here it is to be remembred that ſhe is a compleat Church, aſſociated together in one intire Eccleſiaſtical Body, with full power to interpret and teach her Subjects all things relating to Faith and Diſcipline: As theſe Kingdoms are a compleat Common-

mon wealth, aſſociated into one civil Body, with full power to interpret and enact all things relating to the Law of Nature and the civil Government of the Kingdoms. As therefore theſe Kingdoms do not truſt their reaſon too far, when they determine concerning the Laws of Nature without Appeal: So neither did our Church truſt her reaſon too far when ſhe determined without Appeal concerning matters relating to Faith. And there is no more inconvenience can befal her Subjects by allowing her this power in this caſe, then can befall them by allowing their Civil Magiſtrates the like power in the other.

§ 20. And 3. to ſhew that ſhe did not intend to contradict the general voice of the viſible Church with which Mr. *M* ſeems to charge her, ſhe was content to refer all Difference between her, and her Neighbour Churches to the Arbitration of a general Council, even of the *Weſt*. And to this ſhe Appealed when the Pope pretended to Excommunicate her. And not only ſhe, but other Proteſtant Churches did the ſame. But the *Roman* Church being Conſcious, that the general Voice and Senſe of the viſible Church was againſt her Uſurpation, durſt not ſtand this Tryal; but without any Authority from God or the viſible Church (if we underſtand by that the general Body of Chriſtians) took on her ſelf to be *Judge, Witneſs, and Accuſer*. Which was more then *Luther* did; for he referred himſelf, and Appealed to a general Council.

§ 21. The third Objection Mr. *M.* alledges againſt the Reformers is their not yielding a due Submiſſion to the Church. For after all his clamour againſt Reaſon, he allows us to *make uſe* of it *with Submiſſion*, he has expreſſed his meaning in this, ſo as it is not eaſie to gueſs, whether he means by ſubmitting our reaſon an intire reſignation of it to believe whatſoever the Church of *Rome* by a Prieſt, or a Council tells us, and then the only uſe of reaſon will be to find out Arguments to defend what ſhe has taught us; or whether by Submiſſion he means only a due regard to her Determinations, ſo that a Man of her Communion ſhall not allow himſelf publickly to oppoſe and contradict her Doctrine. This laſt he ſeems to underſtand by Submiſſion; becauſe he oppoſes

it

it to *Contradiction and Petulancy.* And then why is not this Submiſſion due as much to the Church of *England* and *Ireland* as *Rome?* Did not Chriſt ſay to the Biſhops of *England* and *Ireland*, *He that hears you hears me,* as well as to the Biſhop of *Rome?*

Sect. 22. But to clear this matter a little, I will ſhew that we pay all due Submiſſion to the Church. And 2. Examine what Submiſſion Mr. *M.* has paid her. When we talk of Submiſſion to the Church, by the Church may be meant either the univerſal Church, or the particular Church wherein we were born, baptized and educated: and to both theſe we profeſs and pay due Submiſſion. The Catholick or Univerſal Church we look on as the Keeper and Witneſs of the Doctrine of Chriſt, and we receive her Teſtimony. The only Queſtion with us is, what Doctrine Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught: and this we believe contained in the Scriptures. Concerning the Senſe of any word in them, we receive likewiſe the Teſtimony of the Catholick Church. Every Doctor approved by her is a Witneſs, and every Council received by her is as the Depoſition of Witneſſes. By this means we know her Senſe in former ages, as well as in this age, and are able to compare them together. Where theſe agree, we have no reaſon to doubt her Veracity; but where one age of her ſays one thing, and another age ſays another thing; we count our ſelves under no obligation to believe either of their Teſtimonies to be a neceſſary part of the Doctrine of Chriſt. 'Tis therefore the Church of all ages, and places, that we reckon the *ground & pillar of Truth.* Whereas Mr. *M.* confines us to the viſible Church; and pretends we are to take the Senſe of all former ages from the preſent. But pray why may not I as well underſtand the Senſe of the Church of the 4*th* age from the Council of *Nice,* as I can underſtand the Senſe of the laſt age from the Council of *Trent?* It was therefore by this Rule, and with ſubmiſſion to this Church, that our firſt Reformers proceeded in their Reformation: and except Mr. *M.* can ſhew (which he has not ſo much as endeavoured to do) that they deviated from this Rule, he has done nothing to prove that they

had not a due Deference and Submiſſion to the Catholick Church: And as ſhe thus ſubmitted to the Senſe of the Univerſal Church, ſo ſhe requires all her Subjects to ſubmit to her, to receive the Faith to which ſhe with the Catholick Church bears teſtimony, to own her Laws of Diſcipline, ſubmit to her Cenſures, and conform to her Conſtitutions. But ſhe pretends to no Dominion over mens Faith; or to oblige them to believe any thing, becauſe ſhe has decreed it. Her Authority is to propoſe as a Witneſs, not to define as a Judge. If any one diſſent from her, he muſt not make a Schiſm, or turn Preacher in contradiction to her Authority. If any one be otherwiſe minded he muſt follow the Apoſtles rule, *Phil.* 3. 15. he muſt conform as far as he can, and yield a paſſive Obedience to her Cenſures, where he cannot give an active to her Commands. While he walks by this Rule, he can neither be a Schiſmatick nor Heretick; and may expect, if he uſe due means, that God will either reveal to him what he wants; or pardon his error if he miſtake.

Sect. 23. This Submiſſion is coherent even with *Calvins* Principles: and though I am not concerned for any private Divine; yet ſince Mr. *M.* has troubled us with ſo few Quotations; I will pay him ſo much reſpect as to take notice of this; and the Reader may from it learn how faithfully he tranſcribes and Engliſheth his Quotations.

The Quotation as in *Calvin.*

Non alius eſt in vitam ingreſſus niſi nos ipſa concipiat in utero, niſi pariat, niſi nos alat ſuis uberibus— Adde quod extra ejus gremium nulla ſperanda eſt peccatorum remiſſio, nec ulla ſalus— lib. 4. *cap.* 1. *Sect.* 4.

Thus in *Engliſh* literally.

There is no other paſſage into Life, except the *viſible Church* conceive us in her Womb, bring us

As tranſcribed by Mr. *M.*

Extra Eccleſiæ gremium nulla ſperanda Salus, nec Remiſſio peccatorum, quia non eſt alius in vitam ingreſſus.

Thus rendered into *Engliſh* by him.

He that will enter into Life, let him mortifie the pride of his own

us forth, and nouriſh us with her Breaſts —— Add to this, that out of her boſom there is no remiſſion of ſins to be expected, nor any Salvation.

own Reaſon, and humbly caſt himſelf at the feet of the Catholick Church.

Both *Calvin* and we own that Pride and all other Paſſions ought to be mortified; and except Mr. *M.* can ſhew that we have uſed our reaſon proudly, that is, not yielded, out of ſome deſign, Paſſion or Prejudice, when our reaſon was convinced, we have juſt reaſon to reckon all his accuſations effects of his own paſſion, and *petulancy* againſt his Mother Church. He confeſſes that many of us *are Catholicks by Inclination.* (I hope we are really ſo:) but *the Tyranny of Prejudice or Intereſt* keeps us *Proteſtants.* But for Prejudice, let the world judge whether our people are more liable to Prejudice, who are allowed to read, and examine, and judge for themſelves; or the members of his Church, that are taught to ſubmit without examination. As for Intereſt, I think it is the Intereſt of every man to continue Proteſtant, if he value his Soul: but for Worldly Intereſt, the Scales are hardly equal. I find not one of their Converts who has loſt by it yet. But whatever our Intereſt is, our Loyalty is unqueſtionable; if *he know divers loyal perſons of the Church of* England, I know none elſe.

Sect. 24. Let us now take a view of his Submiſſion to the Church; 1. For the Catholick Church, he has taken the liberty to cut off what members he thought fit, and has reduced her to a fourth part of Chriſtians: he has obtruded Articles of Faith on her to which ſhe never gave Teſtimony; and has ſubjected her to a Head at *Rome* to whom God never ſubjected her; that is, he has created a Catholick Church out of his own head, and rejected that of Chriſts planting.

2. As for the particular Church, which made him a Member of Chriſt by Baptiſm, this his ſpiritual Mother he has pronounced a Harlot, and her Children *By-blows*, he has condemned *her Sacraments*, degraded *her Biſhops* to whom he ſware Obedience, renounced *her Orders*, & given her the title of an *unſanctified Nation.*

In ſhort, as far as lay in his power, he has expoſed the Nakedneſs of his Mother. Behold the *Petulancy and Contradiction* of an undutiful Son. But thanks be to God, notwithſtanding his feeble attempts, *her Bow abides in ſtrength, and the Arms of her Hands are made ſtrong by the Hands of the mighty God of* Jacob. Geneſ. 49. 24.

CHAP. VI.

ALthough Mr. *M.* hath nothing new in his Latine Addition, but only repeats what he ſaid, firſt in his Preface, and then in his Book; yet I did not think it fit to let what he has ſaid in this Language be without ſome Animadverſions in the ſame.

Ad dubia quæ proponuntur ſuper Reformatione Anglicana, ſic reſpondetur.

Ad 1. An *Eccleſia Anglicana* ſit *tota Eccleſia?*

Reſp. Quàm abſurdum ſit ut una particularis Eccleſia ſe eſſe totam Catholicam Chriſti Eccleſiam, extra quam non eſt ſalus, impudenter jactitet, videant Romanenſes. Eccleſia Anglicana membrum duntaxat Eccleſiæ Catholicæ ſeſe exiſtimat: Omnium Eccleſiarum *Sacramenta* à Chriſto inſtituta *amplectitur*, dummodo in unitate fidei, in materiâ debitâ, & ſub formâ præſcriptâ celebrentur. An Nos, vel ipſius Eccleſiæ Romanæ Baptiſmum rejicimus? aut an illa noſtrum non recipit?

Ad 2. *Num Eccleſia Anglicana recipit Sacramenta* Lutheranorum, *&c.*

Reſp. Sacramenta *Lutheranorum, &c.* vera eſſe Sacramenta; & forte ſolus eſt Mr. *M.* qui aliter ſentit. Sacramenta non ſunt eorum Sacramenta, à quibus celebrantur; ſed Chriſti & Eccleſiæ: ſicut nos docuit Sanctus *Auguſtinus* contra Donatiſtas Ep. 48. *Non in vobis mutamus in quibus eſtis nobiſcum* —— *Nobiſcum autem eſtis*

eſtiu in Baptiſmo, in Symbolo, in cæteris Dominicis Sacramentis, & paulò ante, *ex Catholicâ enim Eccleſiâ ſunt omnia Dominica Sacramenta, quæ ſic habetis & datis, quemadmodum habebantur & dabantur, etiam priùs quam inde exiretis; non tamen ideò non habetis quia ibi non eſtis, unde ſunt quæ habetis,* hæc ille de Sacramentis Hæreticorum. Donatiſta itaque eſt, qui Sacramentum rejicit, quia à Schiſmaticis celebrari putat; multo magis qui eorum Sacramenta rejicit, qui fidem Catholicam profitentur, & ſe ſtudioſos unitatis Eccleſiaſticæ, & fraternæ charitatis exhibent.

Ad 3. *Unde miſſus eſt* Cranmerus *ad prædicandum Evangelium ſuum Reformatum?*

Reſp. A Chriſto miſſus eſt *Cranmerus* per manus Epiſcoporum Angliæ ſecundùm Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ inſtitutionem ad prædicandum, non ſuum, ſed Chriſti Evangelium: probandum igitur eſt, Evangelium Reformatum aliud eſſe à Chriſti Evangelio, priuſquam mandatum Miſſionis exceſſiſſe dicatur *Cranmerus. Contra Eccleſiam Romanam non rebelluvit,* quoniam illi jure ſubjectus non erat, neque ab ea Miſſionem aut jurisdictionem propriè recepit. Eccleſia quæ illum miſit in communione erat cum Eccleſiâ Romanâ, non illi tamen ſubjecta, jure aliquo divino.

Ad 4. *An liceat Miniſtro ab Eccleſiâ Anglicanâ fugitivo prædicare contra eam,* &c?

Reſp. Videat ipſe, per quam Miſſionem publicè per hanc chartam prædicat contra Eccleſiam cui obedientiam juravit? Eſt enim & hoc, prædicationis genus efficaciſſimum.

Ad 5. *Utrum defectus Miſſionis ſit error in Fundamentis?*

Reſp. Si per Miſſionem intelligitur externa illa, quæ ſecundum Canones fit; defectus in eâ non eſt ſemper error in Fundamentis: multi enim Epiſcopi Romani ejuſmodi Miſſione caruerunt. Concedo furti & Latrocinii reum eſſe, qui ſine regulari externâ Miſſione in ovile ingreditur; non tamen inde ſequitur, omnia quæ facit aut mala aut nulla eſſe cum ſemel in ovile ingreſſus ſit. Simoniacus aut intruſus fur eſt & latro; an igitur Sacramenta ab ipſo celebrata nulla ſunt aut invalida? Omnino tamen deeſt ei Miſſio interna, & defectus eſt in externâ.

Ad 6.

Ad 6. *Utrum* Cranmerus *intravit per oſtium Parliamenti?*

Reſp. Intravit invitus (ut ſere omnes boni Epiſcopi) per oſtium quod illi leges, tam Eccleſiaſticæ quam civiles, ſecundum ſacras Scripturas, monſtraverunt: *Cantent* ſi modo poſſunt, *hanc cantilenam ſectarii*; & ſi placet ſit illis pro Magiſtro Symphoniæ Mr. *M.* nunquam tamen Harmoniæ regulis reſpondebit eorum cantus. Objicit nobis *varium & Multiplicem Scripturæ ſenſum*, ſed immeritò, ipſe enim ſi Chriſtianus eſt, objectionem ſolvere tenetur, aut ſaltem interpretem aſſignare, qui verum Scripturarum ſenſum à falſo hucuſq; diſcreverit, illumque verbis expreſſerit, quorum ſenſus non æquè multiplex eſt, ac ſenſus Scripturarum. Ac objicit *ſine tali judice altercari in æternum* neceſſe eſt: concedo equidem quod illi quibus ambitio & lucrum dominantur, in æternum altercabuntur ſub quovis Judice: nec aliter voluit Deus; æquum enim eſt, quod Impii & ſuperbi in Hæreſes & Factiones labi permittantur; at boni & modeſti ſub paſtoribus ſibi à Chriſto aſſignatis vivent, ſine altercationibus quæ unitatem ſcindunt.

Dicit 7. *Ad hæc poſtulata ſæpius ſe quæſiviſſe reſponſum, ſed nullum hactenus inveniſſe.* A quibus hæc quæſivit? An à noſtris? Vix credo, nullum enim invenio, qui hæc illum quærentem audivit, aut ſomniavit; ſi igitur quæſiverit, ab aliis certè, non à noſtris (à quibus oportuit) quæſivit; fortè a fratribus Monaſticis quorum conſortio per annum præteritum ſe totum dedit; non autem miremur aut illis defuiſſe reſponſum, aut ſi quod habuiſſent celaſſe. Addit tandem *reſponſum* (*quod dicit a multis obtendi ſolere*) *ſcilicet* Cranmerum *cum ſodalibus ordines accepiſſe à Chriſto per manus Epiſcoporum pontificiorum*; ſi per pontificios intelligit Epiſcopos in communione cum pontifice Romano, verum eſt at ſi per pontificios, intelligit Epiſcopos qui ſe Subjectos Papæ jure divino agnoverunt, æque falſum eſt quàm quod maximè; ut igitur Chriſtiani Epiſcopi, non ut pontificii, ordines conferendi poteſtatem habebant; quâ uſi ſunt in aſſignandis ſibi Succeſſoribus; quâ etiam *Cranmerum* Chriſtianum, non pontificium Epiſcopum conſecrarunt; quâ tandem errores & corruptelas quæ in Divina irrepſerant, ſecundum Scripturas ſacras & ſenſum veterum reformaverunt: & hâc

curâ

curâ ſe veros paſtores probârunt: *Audiendi itaque erunt*: & Mr. *M.* qui illos audire recuſat, inter Rebelles filios numerandus eſt. Cum igitur primi Reformatores ſubjecti non eſſent pontifici, ſed Co-Epiſcopi, non magis *adverſus Doctrinam Eccleſiæ Romanæ inſurgere* exiſtimandi erant, quam Regnum Angliæ inſurgeret contra leges Galliæ, ſi ſe & ſubditos & ſtatum ſuum ſecundum leges naturæ reformaverit: nullus itaq; *hic nodus* niſi quem fallax Mri *M.* imaginatio ligavit. Solus culpandus pontifex, qui revera *judicem teſtem & accuſatorem* egit, & à ſociis ſuis Epiſcopis quòd jure ſuo utebantur, ſeſe & Eccleſiam ſuam abſcidit, pacemq; cum illis noluit.

Ad 8. *An cuilibet Eccleſiæ nationali jus ſeſe reformandi competit?*

Reſp. Nihil contra objicit dubitator, niſi ſi ita ſe res habeat, *tum pari jure reformatam fuiſſe gentem Scoticam ad Calviniſmum &c.* quod nullo modo ſequitur; non ſolum enim poteſtas quæ reformat, legitima eſſe ſed etiam legitimè procedere debet. At ſi quæ in illis gentibus circa reformationem illegitimè facta fuiſſent, non erant corrigenda concitando factiones & ſchiſmata contra publicam earum Eccleſiarum pacem, nec privati in partes contra paſtores ſolicitandi (eſt enim illud remedium morbo plerumq; pernicioſius) ſed ad meliorem frugem reducendæ erant errantes Eccleſiæ communi Chriſtianitatis concilio & hortatu; præſertim dum errores ſuos aliis non impoſuerunt. Eo uſque enim unitatem deſeruiſſe non ſunt æſtimandæ. Quod in Sancto Cypriano manifeſtum eſt, qui licet cum ſuo provinciali concilio in errorem lapſus eſt, & in eo uſque ad terminum vitæ perſeveravit, à ſchiſmate tamen à Sancto Auguſtino in libris de Baptiſmo excuſatur, *quod nullum à jure, Communionis ſi diverſum ſenſerit, amovebat; neq; Tyrannico terrore ad obſequendi neceſſitatem collegas ſuos adegit, quando habeat omnis Epiſcopus pro licentiâ libertatis, & poteſtatis ſuæ, arbitrium proprium, tamq; judicari ab alio non poſſit, quam nec ipſe poteſt judicare.* Ut loquitur ipſe Sanctus Cyprianus in concilio Carthaginienſi.

Exiſtimat verò ille, *falſum eſſe quod facta erat mutatio Religionis ex voto gentis, & Cleri Anglicani, ſed ex vertigine paucorum, & ad annales illorum temporum* nos relegat. Ad eos itaq; eamus, indeq;

deq; manifeſtum erit, nullam mutationem majori conſenſu aut factam fuiſſe aut receptam, quàm reformationem in Anglia. Si non faviſſent nobis annales illorum temporum, unde erat quòd tam ſollicitè conquiſiti, & aboliti ſunt ſub Maria, idq; per mandatum publicum. Ut videre eſt ex Rot. Pat.

Ad 9. *An licuit Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, cum eſſet membrum Eccleſiæ Catholicæ, ſemet abſcindere à reliquo corpore?*

Reſp. Nunquam ſemet abſcidit; manet illi unita unitate fidei, & charitate. Regnum Angliæ membrum eſt ſocietatis humanæ æque ac Eccleſia Anglicana eſt membrum Catholicæ: nec magis Eccleſia eſtimanda eſt ſemet abſcindere à reliquo corpore, cum ſe pro jure ſuo reformat; quam regnum ſemet à ſocietate humana abſcindere, ſi ad ſuam reformationem Leges novas condat. Conata equidem eſt Eccleſia Romana noſtram à communione Catholica abſcindere, illi communionem ſuam denegando; at reſpondere poſſumus quod Eccleſia Orientalis per Firmilianum, & Africana per Sanctum Cyprianum Stephano Epiſcopo Romano ipſas excommunicare nitenti, reſponderunt. Ep. 75. *Peccatum quàm magnum tibi exaggeraſti, quando te à tot gregibus ſcidiſti? excidiſti enim teipſum, noli te fallere, dum enim putas omnes à te abſtineri poſſe, ſolum te ab omnibus abſtinuiſti.*

Ad 10. *An depravatus fuit per totum orbem verus Dei cultus ante ortum Cranmerum?*

Reſp. Poſſunt ea in cultum divinum irrepere per univerſum orbem quæ reformatione indigeant; nec tamen inde ſequitur cultum Dei verum tolli, aut depravari: manet aurum verum, licèt à ſcoriis non penitus purgatum ſit.

Ad 11. *Utrum hodie extra regnum Angliæ & Hiberniæ nullus extat purus & Apoſtolicus Dei cultus?*

Reſp. Quod extat alibi talis cultus quoad eſſentialia: at forte neq; in Anglia, neq; alibi tam purus aſſerendus eſt Dei cultus, ut nihil in eo quoad accidentalia imperfectum inveniatur; in ipſis Apoſtolicis Eccleſiis, viventibus adhuc Apoſtolis, multa indigebant reformatione, ut colligere poſſumus ab ipſâ ſcripturâ.

Ad 12. *An liceat populo Anglicano comminiſci ſibi Eccleſiam à toto orbe diviſam?* *Reſp.*

Reſp Non licere, neq; talem commentus eſt; è contra, omni Eccleſiæ veræ, catholicâ fide & charitate, unita manet Eccleſia Anglicana. Qui nolunt cum illâ pacem, diviſam ſibi Eccleſiam commenti ſunt. Nullius Eccleſiæ Sacramenta aut Ritus damnat, integrum Sacramentum Euchariſtiæ ſuis reſtituit, ſuperfluos & ſuperſtitioſos Ritus in rebus divinis abrogavit, & aliis Eccleſiis ut abrogent, ſuadet; cum autem in eas poteſtatem non habeat, non eſt cur ſibi damnandi illos officium arroget, ſed (ut in ſimili caſu Cyprianus in concilio Carthaginenſi.) *Expectemus univerſi Judicium Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, qui unus & ſolus habet poteſtatem, & præponendi Epiſcopos in Eccleſiæ ſuæ gubernatione, & de actu eorum judicandi.* Non exiſtimandus eſt quid ſit damnatio intelligere, qui tam facile totas Eccleſias damner, & Satanæ tradat.

Ad 13. *Utrum Cranmerus fuit primus Archiepiſcopus Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ?*

Reſp. Stultiſſimè hoc quæri. Videat Catalogum Epiſcoporum, & dicat an primus ſit. At qui illum anteceſſerunt erant Pontificii, ergo defuit illi ſucceſſio. Itane? ſi fuiſſent nigri aut albi, ipſe autem Ruſus, an defuiſſet illi ſucceſſio? non magis ad ordines pertinet, an pontificius, aut græcus ſit, bonus, aut malus, qui eos confert, quam ſi ſit niger aut albus. Ordines (pariter ac ſacramenta) non ſunt pontificiorum aut reformatorum, ſed Chriſti & Eccleſiæ, nec alicujus Sectæ ſed Eccleſiæ ſe ſacerdotem profeſſus eſt *Cranmerus*: ad eum finem conſecratus eſt. Sola Quæſtio eſt, an bene ſe geſſerit in domo Dei, ubi œconomus conſtitutus erat: ut id vero innoteſcat, examinanda ſunt quæ fecit, & cum factis miſſio comparanda; ſi nihil non Chriſtianum in Eccleſia ſtatuit, ſatis erat illi abundè Chriſtiana miſſio ad mandata Chriſti implenda; aſſerit ſciſcitator noſter importunus *Cantuarienſes Epiſcopos per novem anteriora ſecula pontificios fuiſſe*, ſine fronte & veritate: cum nemo ante Anſelmum de Pontificis poteſtate qualis nunc vendicatur, ſomniaverit; cum leges Angliæ ante Thomam Becket, ut in Matthæo Pariſienſi videre eſt ad annum 1164. poteſtati univerſalis paſtoris directè contrariæ fuiſſent; cum ipſe *Warhamus* immediatus *Cranmeri* prædeceſſor, cum aſſentiente tota convocatione, ſupremam

Regis poteſtatem in Eccleſiaſticis agnoviſſet: quam ſi quis Pontificius agnoſceret, erat & *Warhamus* pontificius. At ſi quis prædeceſſorum ejus aliter ſentiebat, num id impediret ſucceſſionem? Reſpondeat Sanctus Cyprianus, qui errantes Anteceſſores in re maximi momenti, ſcilicet de aquâ vini loco in Euchariſtiâ ſubſtitutâ, ita excuſat. *Ep.* 63. *Si quis de Anteceſſoribus noſtris vel ignoranter vel ſimpliciter non hoc obſervavit; poteſt ſimplicitati ejus de indulgentiâ Domini venia concedi, nobis verò non poterit ignoſci, qui nunc à Domino admoniti & inſtructi ſumus.*

Ad 14. *Utrum ſit vera Eccleſia quæ non habet ligitimos Paſtores?*

Reſp. Quod poteſt eſſe vera; teſtis Eccleſia Romana, quæ tot habuit Pontifices Hæreticos, Schiſmaticos, Simoniacos, Intruſos, & Dubios, qui omnes Legitimi paſtores non erant, An igitur Romæ defecit Eccleſia? poſſunt etiam eſſe vera Sacramenta ubi veri non ſunt Paſtores, ipſa enim latente Romanâ Eccleſiâ Fœmina & Hæretica verè Baptizat, an illa eſt verus paſtor? Reformati *veros paſtores* habent; inepte igitur quæritur *an præſtat ſub unâ ſpecie cum* Pſeudo *Catholicis communicare, quàm ſub nullâ cum Reformatis?* nullus Reformatus enim eſt, qui non ſub duabus ſpeciebus communicat; imo præſtat illi nullum quàm mutilum Sacramentum, cui id vitium innotuit.

Ad 15. *Utrum* 39 *Articuli Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ ſunt Articuli fidei vel non?*

Reſp. Omnes non ſunt; pleriq; negativi Articuli ad rejiciendas vel falſas vel ſuperſtitioſas opiniones excogitabantur, quas alii pro Catholica fide obtrudere conati ſunt; tales autem non ſunt dicendi Articuli fidei: quod vel hinc liquet, ſi quis pro fidei Articulo venditaret, eras affore extremum judicium; qui id ad fidem pertinere negaverit, non dicendus eſſet novum Articulum fidei excogitaſſe; ſic enim infiniti eſſe poſſent, & quilibet cudendi Articulum poteſtatem haberet. Alii inter 39. ad politiam & regimen Eccleſiæ pertinent, qui plerumq; inter fidei Articulos non ſunt numerandi alii ſunt veritates magni momenti, quæ verò tuto ignorari à privatis Chriſtianis poſſunt, imo ſi pertinacia abſit, non credi. Alij ſunt revera omnibus cognoſcendi & credendi,

qui

qui ſoli ſub nomine Articulorum fidei propriè veniunt. Quod verò infert ille (ſcilicet) ſi non ſunt Articuli fidei, *ergo nemo tenetur fidem illis habere ſub periculo ſalutis*, non ſequitur: poteſt enim ſalus periclitari imò amitti, pertinaciter negando alias veritates, quàm quæ propriè ad fidem ſpectant. Cum igitur Articuli 39 ad diverſitatem opinionum evitandam ab Eccleſiâ proponuntur; nullus qui pacem amat, illis ſe opponere debet.

Ad 16. *Utrum Religio Reformata ſit diviſibilis in ſemper diviſibiles.*

Reſp. Quòd videtur iſtam quæſtionem ut pleráſq; ſuas à jocularibus recentium in Collegio oratiunculis mutuatus fuiſſe: & quod veriſimilius hoc facit, ſolis fere illis inſignem ibi ſeſe M. M. reddidit.

Ad 17. *An in re Euchariſticâ Argumentum à ſenſibus ductum ſit fallibile?*

Reſp. Argumentum iſtud fallere non poteſt: ratio quam proponit dubitandi nulla eſt, *revera enim lignum pulchrum erat oculis, neq; oculus* primam noſtram parentem *decepit*; ſed ſefellit ſeſe homo, dum ſerpenti potiùs quàm Deo credidit de effectu manducationis, (ſcilicet) quod non moreretur etiamſi comederet, de quo oculus nihil illi retulit. Credulitas itaq; non ſenſus primos noſtros parentes decepit, caveat itaq; à credulitate, qui in quacunq; re decipi non vult.

Ad 18. *An Eccleſia Anglicana mutabilis ſit ad nutum Parliamenti?*

Reſp. Quod non eſt ita mutabilis, neq; unquam ita mutata fuit: poteſt Rex cum Parliamento, temporalibus præmiis aut pœnis quæ ſancienda ſunt in Religione ſancire: quis niſi mente captus hanc poteſtatem illis negabit? aut quis niſi manifeſtò falſus plus circa Religionem reformatam Parliamentum tentâſſe dicet? Sunt igitur duo in ſtabiliendâ aut reformandâ Religione diſtinguenda: primum eſt, judicare de veritate Religionis, & illam quæ vera eſſe judicata eſt Chriſti authoritate ſub ſalutis amittendæ periculo omnibus commendare; alterum eſt, ſic commendatam ab Eccleſiâ Religionem temporalibus præmiis aut pœnis munire. Primum

 petinet

pertinet ad Eccleſiam, ſecundum ad civilem Poteſtatem. In ſtabiliendâ Reformatione, Eccleſia Anglicana in Convocatione, civilis Poteſtas in Parliamento, propriam ſibi Provinciam ſigillatim curaverunt.

Ad 19. *Utrum ſpiritus Calvini negantis, ac Lutheri affirmantis corporalem præſentiam, ſit uterque à Deo?*

Reſp. Quod neq; *Calvinus* ab inſpiratione ſpiritus negavit, neq; *Lutherus* affirmavit aliquid de corporali præſentiâ. Ridiculè itaq; quæritur an uterq; ſit à Deo. Author Quæſtionis, cum inter Fanaticos educatus eſſet, audivit omnia aut ſpiritui bono aut malo attribui, & videtur adhuc in eâ ſententiâ hærere; & inde ſomniat, non poſſe aliquem vel affirmare vel negare aliquid niſi ex ſpiritus alicujus impulſu. Quod tamen ſomnium vel hoc exemplo excutiat, *Paulus* III. Papa affirmavit ſe poſſe *Henricum* VIII. imò quemlibet Regem deponere, & per Bullam idem tentavit. At M. M. (ut ſpero) negat poteſtatem deponendi Regem Angliæ ineſſe Papæ. Quæro igitur an ſpiritus utriuſq; idem ſit, aut an uterq; poſſit eſſe à Deo?

Ad 20. *Nonne impudentiſſimus fuit Calvinus uſurpato ſibi munere reformandi orbem cum juvenis eſſet 26 annorum?*

Reſp. Non fuit impudentiſſimus, impudentior enim Johannes decimus, qui Hugonem puerum quinquennem in Archiepiſcopum Rhemenſem & Primatem Galliæ confirmavit, ut videre eſt apud Flodardum Hiſtor. Rhem. Lib. 4. Cap. 17 & 18. Impudentior Johannes Papa undecimus Sergii tertii nothus, qui ſtudio & authoritate matris Maroziæ infamis ſcorti & adhuc amoribus aptæ, in Vicarium Chriſti univerſalem juvenis ſucceſſit. Teſte Luitprando Lib. 3. Cap. 12. Si hæc nihil ad ſe exiſtimat dubitator, ſciat neq; ad nos *Calvinum*: de quo tamen nihil inimicis credendum; non enim ſibi reformandi munus uſurpavit, ſed reformantibus ſemet adjunxit.

Ad 21. *An ex utero Reformationis effluxerint cædes —— & bella civilia que emerſerunt anno 1641?*

Reſp. Quod non. Cædes enim rapinæ & bella plus quam civilia quibus in vitas innocentium ultra omne exemplum tunc temporis

poris ſævitum eſt in Hibernia, ex Cleri Romani Sanguinolentâ inſtigatione originem duxerunt. Quæ vero in Angliâ & Scotiâ nata ſunt mala, non magis ex utero reformationis effluxerunt, quam gladius ſchiſmata & contentiones è doctrina Chriſti.

Ad 22. *Utrum Africa ſit feracior monſtrorum, quam Britania fanaticorum?*

Reſp. Britannia non magis ſerax eſt Fanaticorum quàm Italia & Hiſpania: fanaticus eſt qui ſe divino ſpiritu agi aut illuminari falſò credit; plures ſunt ibi & in majori pretio qui hoc ſibi vendicant, quam in Anglia. Fanaticus eſt qui ex ſcripturæ ſenſu malè intellecto ſeſe legitimis paſtoribus publicè opponit. Tollatur *Inquiſitio*, & inveniet quamlibet regionem non minus feracem eſſe ejuſmodi fanaticorum quam Britanniam, ſola igitur Inquiſitio eſt quâ melius ſe habent in hac parte Italia & Hiſpania quàm Britannia: at nos malumus fanaticos quàm inquiſitionem: idq; ex Chriſti præſcripto qui ut zizania cum tritico ſimul creſcere ſinerent, ſervos juſſit. Plures & magis pernicioſæ hæreſes in primævâ Eccleſiâ ortæ ſunt, pluresq; fanatici, quàm inter Reformatos. An ſanius contra *judicium diſcretionis* & *ſcripturas* jam arguitur ex eo quod eorum abuſu fanatici; fiunt quàm contra Religionem Chriſtianam, quod ejus prætextu tot abominandæ hæreſes, quas recenſent Sanctus Epiphanius & Sanctus Irenæus, orbem inquinaverunt?

Ad 23 & 25. *Quibus de legitimatione Elizabethæ & Mariæ filiarum Henrici octavi quæritur.*

Reſp. Elizabetham legitimos habuiſſe natales. utpote quæ nata erat ex matrimonio legitimè cum Matre ejus contracto poſt ſententiam divortii Patris & Catherinæ; vel potius poſtquam conjugium eorum nullum eſſe pronuntiatum eſt. Nec minus tamen Maria patri tanquam legitima ſuccedere debuit, cum nata eſſet antequam vitium matrimonii, propter quod nullum judicatum eſt, aut patri aut matri innotuit; Filius enim natus ex matrimonio bona fide vel alterius parentis inito eſt vere legitimus ſecundum legem Civilem. Ex craſsâ igitur juris ignorantiâ nata eſt iſt opinio, non poſſe & Elizabetham & Mariam legitimas eſſe regni Hæredes.

Sed

Sed quærit & urget *quâ Authoritate uxorem ſuam Catherinam repudiavit Henricus?*

Reſp. Authoritate legis Divinæ, judicio Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, cujus erat judicare de Matrimoniis infra Angliam initis, concilio ſententia & approbatione fere omnium Cordatiorum & Doctiorum iſtius ætatis prius habitis. At quâ Authoritate Mr. *M.* damnat Reges & Reginas Angliæ, aut de eorum jure ad Regnum determinat, ipſe reſpondeat.

Ad 24. Utrum *laudanda ſit ſapientia Henrici Octavi, qui expulſo uno Papa Romano infinitos Papas ex ſubditis ſuſcitavit?*

Reſp. Henricus Octavus expulit quidem Romani Pontificis uſurpatam juriſdictionem ſecundum veteres regni leges, nullum vero Papam ex ſubditis ſuſcitavit; ſupponit igitur quæſtio falſum, & frivola eſt: nullus enim Papa dicendus, niſi qui juriſdictionem univerſalem per Eccleſiam Catholicam ſibi vendicat: Quiſnam è ſubditis Henrici id ſibi unquam vendicavit? At permiſit Henricus illis Scripturam, an hoc eſt Papam ſuſcitare? Quot Papas ſuſcitavit Chriſtus, qui hoc omnibus permiſit? At ſecundum privatum ſenſum Scripturas interpretari cuilibet Henricus conceſſit: fallitur & falſus eſt Mr. *M.* Nullus enim rigidior ſubmiſſionis in rebus ad Religionem pertinentibus exactor à ſuis quam Henricus: Nemo qui cum ſenſum Scripturæ quem pro Catholico habebat ab omnibus amplectendum ſub majori pœna Curavit. Neque ſi hominibus aures & oculos reſtituiſſet in re Religiosâ, Papas ſuſcitaſſe aut Eccleſiaſticam Authoritatem ſubvertiſſe dicendus eſſet: quod abſurde & ignoranter objiciunt Papicolæ.

Ad 26. *Si nefas ſit mutare Religionem Parliamentariâ authoritate ſtabilitam, unde licuit Elizabethæ Religionem evertere Catholicam regni legibus ſtabilitam?*

Reſp. Nefas eſt Catholicam Religionem quâcunq; authoritate evertere; neq; Catholicam Religionem ſed Romanam Elizabetha mutavit; quæ vi & fraude ſtabilita, jure totius regni & majoris & ſenioris partis Eccleſiæ conſenſu everſa eſt, odioſam enim ſefallaciis ineptiis, tyrannide & vivicomburiis innocentium reddiderat. Hinc

facile

facile ad abrogandas leges & civiles pœnas quibus iſta religio ſteterat, Parliamentum ſemet accinxit: nec difficilius (ſancitis Canonibus Eccleſiaſticis) reformatam religionem ſtabilire Eccleſiæ per ſtatum eſt. Nec aliter nec melius veritas ſtabiliri in noſtris regnis poteſt. Ejuſmodi conſtitutionem & ſtabilimentum Romanæ Religionis in Anglia vel ipſius infallibilitatis jacturâ Pontifex redimeret: at ſine vi, ſine fraude & fallaciis ut hoc fiat deſperandum eſſe novit, & inde eſt quod in tot facies ſe vertit.

At quærit *quomodo poterant jurare Elizabetham eſſe caput Eccleſiæ, quando non poterant jurare eam eſſe caput Regni?*

Itane *Petrus M.* quam regnum, quam leges, quam naſcendi jus, quam omnes orbis Principes, & ipſe tandem Papa pro legitima Regina habuerunt, ſolus pro ſpuria impune rejiciet? Qui talia audet, perdidit cũ religione frontem, & cũ ſenſibus & ratione ejuravit & omnẽ exuit ſeſe modeſtiam. Fuit itaq; Regina caput regni: ut vero caput Eccleſiæ eam eſſe aliquis juraret, nec lex juſſit, nec in his verbis Elizabetha exegit. Quatuordecim equidem Epiſcopos ſedibus expulit, & meritò, ob recuſatum juramentum primatus, quod ipſi excogitavere, quod toties ſuſceperant, & quod ſtrenuè ſub patre & fratre propugnaverant, ſed non authoritate ſuâ ſolâ non inauditos expulit, ut Maria Epiſcopos quibus ſucceſſerant: neq; recuſantes igni cremandos mandavit, ut Maria; ſed è contra leniter illos tractavit, illiſq; uti vellent vivere permiſit, unde nihil contra Reginam moliti ſunt, aut contra reformationem, cui non conſcientiâ ſed pudore prohibiti, ut plurimum conſentire noluerunt. Quod vel ex eo colligi poteſt, quod cum Epiſcopis in eorum locos ſurrogatis pacifice pleriq; vixerunt, neq; alios præter reformatos ſibi ſucceſſores conſtituêre. Abi tu & fac ſimiliter.

Ad 27. *Nonne Liturgiam ſuam ſuffuratus eſt Cranmerus ex Miſſali, Rituali, & Breviario Romano?*

Reſp. Reformatores primævæ puritatis ſtudioſi non tam novam Liturgiam condere, quam veterem reſtituere in animo habuerunt. Inde eſt quod quæ vetera erant, in illa adhuc manent, imo multa à vetere Gallicanâ Liturgiâ quâ ſemel utebantur hæ Regiones, reſtituta in noſtrâ Liturgiâ invenimus; neque ullum

officium

officium in qua antiquæ Liturgiæ conſentiunt, omiſit Eccleſia noſtra. An Liturgiam itaq; à novis additamentis purgare eſt illam ſuffurari?

Ad 28. *Nonne juramento primatus tenentur Proteſtantes obtemperare Regi ut ſupremo Gubernatori?*

Reſp. Rebellis eſt qui negat. At quid ſibi volunt, *hæc verba, tam in omnibus ſpiritualibus quàm temporalibus?* *Reſp.* Explicari hæc in Articulo 27. ſcilicet Regi ſoli temporalem gladium commiſſum eſſe: Ac proinde omnes ſive *Eccleſiaſtici ſint ſive Civiles, in Officio contineat, & contumaces & delinquentes Gladio civili coerceat.* Sive igitur Clericus ſive Laicus ſit qui civili Gladio puniendus eſt, ſolus Rex eſt qui inſligendi pœnam iſtam habet poteſtatem: imò etiamſi Clericus ille aut Laicus propter hæreſin aut aliam quamcunq; cauſam quam maxime ſpiritualem iſta pœna eſſet mulctandus; neq; hoc eſt omnimodam obedientiam tam religioſam quàm civilem Regi præſtare: reſtat enim Eccleſiæ ſua poteſtas ſpiritualis integra, nempe verbi, ſacramentorum & ſpiritualium pœnarum diſtributio. Quicunq; igitur excommunicandus eſt, propter quamcunq; cauſam, ab Eccleſiâ non à Rege eſt iſti cenſuræ ſubjiciendus. Satis igitur conſtabit juriſdictio quam Regi tribuimus ſine clavium poteſtate, totáq; ſecundùm Articulum prædictum ſpectabit ad gladium civilem. Cum dicitur igitur Regem eſſe unicum gubernatorem tam in ſpiritualibus quàm temporalibus, intelligitur illum eſſe unicum temporalem gubernatorem, cui jus gladii in omnibus rebus tam Eccleſiaſticis quàm temporalibus competit, & qui ſolus Judex eſt ſupremus, quando & quoties uti debet eâ poteſtate. At conceſſo, omnimodam obedientiam quæ homini præſtari poteſt nos illi debere, quomodo ſequitur quod infert M. M. quod oportet nos cum *Calviniano eſſe Calvinianos, Arianos cum Ariano*; Annon cives Romani totam iſtam obedientiam, quam per hoc juramentum vendicârunt noſtri Reges, Papæ præſtare tenentur? An igitur oportet eos, cum Hæretico Papa aut Schiſmatico, Hæreticos aut Schiſmaticos eſſe; Quia Papa eſt unicus illis ſupremus gubernator, tam in omnibus Spiritualibus quàm temporalibus?

Nos

Nos vero quæ Regis ſunt Regi tribuimus, reſervatis Deo quæ ſunt Dei. In omnibus Regi vel paſſivam vel activam obedientiam præſtare tenemur; & *ſi quando lis inter Regem & ſubditos* orta fuerit, an licitum ſit quod imperatur; neceſſe eſt quemlibet pro ſe Judicem eſſe: nec ulla hic ſomes bellorum civilium; id enim vitabitur ſi modo vel activa vel paſſiva obedientia præſtetur. Quod contra hanc Doctrinam affert facile diluitur (ſcilicet) *tum Regem non ſupremum eſſe ſed Scripturam & ſtatuta*, non enim ſcriptura aut ſtatuta ſunt gubernatores, ſed ſuprema regula ſecundum quam Regi eſt obediendum. Ut vero quæſtionem quæſtione rependam, videat, An ſe tam facile expediat; Si quando lis inter Eccleſiam & civilem poteſtatem orta fuerit, quæro quis inter illas erit Judex? Si Papa inveſtituras Epiſcoporum, verbi gratia, immunitatem Clericorum, proviſiones & appellationes ſub cenſuris decreverit, repugnantemq; Regem excommunicaverit, quis de gravibus his cauſis inter illos judicabit? aſſignandus Judex, niſi mavis illos in æternum altercari, quis quæſo erit Judex inter concilium Papale & Comitia Regum?

Ad 29. *Cur Reformationem tam avide amplexi ſunt tot Nobiles ſub Elizabethâ?*

Reſp. Nihil ad nos cur amplexi ſunt, quidam Chriſtum etiam ex invidia prædicarunt. Sperabit vero meliora quilibet qui charitati non valedixit, præſertim cum meminerit quot viros ſcientiâ celebres, concilio graves, fortitudine claros, pietate inſignes protulit iſta ætas, quâ neq; prior aliqua ætas felicior, nec quam poſterior forte æquabit. Nulla tot viris claruit quibus patria & reſpublica cordi erant, quibus iſta vitiorum ſeges ignota, quæ præſenti ætati incubuit. Inimicus eſt Anglorum famæ virtuti & armis qui aliquid vel ſuggeret, quod tot heroum gloriæ obeſſet; quorum virtuti patria debet, quod ſupra Garamantas & Indos, & ad uſq; ſydera nota eſt. Novimus quid jam facit Nobiles, & è Nobilibus papicolas: ſpondeat ille pro omnibus qui jam Papiſmum amplectuntur, & ego viciſſim ſpondebo omnes Nobiles ſub Elizabetha non lucri ſed Conſcientiæ gratia reformationem amplexos.

Ad 30. *Cur plebs Anglicana novitatis avida odit Papiſmum?*

Reſp. Propter crudelitatem, falſitatem, tyrannidem & novita-

tem, quæ omnia nativo Anglorum genio repugnant; non enim (ut falsò insinuat) Anglicanâ plebs novitatis avidior quàm quælibet alia gens. At Religio est quibusdam, patriam odio, patrios mores fastidio,& populares,calumniis prosequi: qui peregrinorum morum & rituum miratores,quicquid externum est quasi verum & vetustum magni faciunt. Illa enim religio,quæ sensum & rationem naturalem tollit, naturalem etiam in patriam & amicos affectum subvertit.

Ad 31. *An Ecclesia Anglicana fallibilis sit vel infallibilis?*

Resp. Particularis Ecclesia licet in se fallibilis, quamdiu tamen se observationi præceptorum divinorum accingit, & mediis quæ Deus illi indulsit industriè utitur, id est quamdiu veritas illi usui est, neque falli neque fallere errore aliquo saluti pernicioso potest: idemq; de quolibet Christiano dicendum. Dum autem actu non fallitur licet fallibilis fundatur super Petram; qui enim super eam fundatus non est, salvus esse non potest,

Ad 32. De *Ligno Scientiæ & Vitæ*, aliud responsum non meretur præter verba Christi, qui malum facit odit lucem, *lignum scientiæ non erat lignum vitæ*, at in eodem Paradiso simul consita sunt à Deo; quæ conjunxit Deus maledictus qui dividit.

Ad 33. *Nonne in Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ desideratur versio Bibliorum multo emendatior & correctior?*

Resp. Versio Bibliorum Anglicana emendatior est vulgari Latinâ versione, licet nihil est ab omni parte perfectum. At non vult Romana Ecclesia emendatiorem, sed nullam in vulgari idiomate versionem. An non præstat igitur, nobiscum versione minus correctâ uti, quam cum Romanis nullâ? mentitur, ubi asserit in versione nostra *vitiari textus, in favorem carnis, & gratiam schismatis*: quod productis ab ipso exemplis patebit.

Gal. 5. 17. Ut à nostris vertitur, nec favet carni, nec schismati. An favere dicendus est carni, qui dicit hominem dum carne ducitur omnia quæ vult spiritus non posse facere: esto tum carni favebat sanctus *Paulus* qui *Rom.* 8. 7. de Carne affirmat *quod legi Dei non est subjecta nec esse potest, qui autem in carne sunt Deo placere non possunt.*

Dan. 4. 24. Caldæis exacte respondent unde nostra est versio,

si

ſi igitur conformis ſit origini, non multum moramur vulgarem Latinam, cujus tamen non alius ſenſus eſt in hoc loco, quàm quem verba Anglicana ferant.

1. *Cor.* 7. 9. ΕΙ ΔΕ ΟΥΚ ΕΓΚΡΑΤΕΥΟΝΤΑΙ de illis dicitur, qui ſui poteſtatem non habent; ita Sanctus *Theodoretus*, qui ad hæc verba hac paraphraſi utitur, *Sin autem cupiditatis impetum ferre non poteſtis, ſed ad ſuſtinendum certamen imbecilli animo eſtis, nulla lex prohibet quo minus Matrimonium contrahatis.*

Item Sanctus *Anſelmus* apud *Lyram*, *Qui propter mentis imbecillitatem non poſſunt continere carnis impulſionem, nubant.*

Item *Lyra*, id eſt, *Si donum continendi non acceperint à Deo.*

Item Commentarius ſub nomine Sancti *Ambroſii*, *Quid ſi impulſu carnis perſeverare ſe viderint non poſſe:* An hi omnes faviſſe carni & ſchiſmatidicendi ſunt, eo quòd noſtræ verſioni aſtipulantur?

Idem dicendum eſt de *Matt.* 19. 11. ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΟΥ ΧΩΡΟΥΣΙ, omnes non capaces ſunt, vel propter ſocordiam vel propter impotentiam, quid hoc ad indulgentiam carnis? An Chriſtus indulgebat carni cùm ſeſe explicans addit ſecundùm vulgarem Latinam (videlicet v. ejuſdem Capitis 12.) *qui poteſt capere, capiat?*

Job. 7. 1. Exacte Hæbræis verbis reſpondent, & ſi marginem inſpicias, Latinis.

Exod. 20. 4. Recte redditur ab Anglis interpretibus, nec à vulgari diſcrepa, quæ non idolum ſed ſculptile reddit: ſculptile vero non melius Anglicè reddi poteſt, quam ut habent noſtra Biblia; nec aliud per idolum intelligebant 70. quam imaginem ad cultum fabrefactum: unde plurima exemplaria ſubſtituunt, ΓΛΥΠΤΟΝ *Deut.* 5. 8. idem igitur ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ & ΓΛΥΠΤΟΝ; nec aliter redditur à Gallis & Italis, quorum alteri in Catechiſmis vulgaribus reddunt *Image Taillée*, alteri *Imagine Sculpita.* Ut videre eſt in *Diario de S. Amour parte* 3. *cap.* 5. ubi hæc ipſa quæſtio coram Cardinalibus diſcutitur: fruſtra igitur in verſionem noſtram inſurgit, quâ dubium eſt an ſincerior extat. Nihil adhuc momenti contra Eccleſiam noſtram protulit, ſi quid habeat proferat tandem; & Argumentis non quæſtionibus, rem agat. Meminerit enim quis ſit, qui plures ejuſmodi proponere poſſet, quàm quas facile ſolvat ſapientior.

FINIS.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE